

MODERN PHILOLOGY

VOLUME XXIV

November 1926

NUMBER 2

AN ASPECT OF THE WORLD-CONQUEST MOTIF IN LITERATURE

In the thirty-third chapter of the *Gargantua* Rabelais represents Picrochole and his captains as formulating a comprehensive plan of world-conquest. This chapter of Rabelais marks the climax in the literary development of a mythological motif whose origin harks back to the infancy of the race in its cradle in Asia, and whose first appearance in literature occurs in the "history" of Alexander generally called the "pseudo-Callisthenes."

Everywhere among primitive peoples a thin line of demarcation divides heroes and gods. A great leader usually is considered, even in his lifetime, as wholly or partly divine, and is sure to be deified upon his death. Linked with this universal tendency is found in the legendary history of the populations that dwelt on the Chaldean plains, long before state and religion began to be dissociated even in thought, the belief that a hero-god of their race who had vanished would reappear some day and unite the peoples of the earth under his sway. This rôle seems originally to have been ascribed to the legendary kings Sargon and Nimrod; the first great historical ruler on whom it was definitely fixed was Nebuchadnezzar. To him legend transferred traits borrowed from the mythical Sargon and Nimrod, among them the trait of the disappearing and reappearing king.

This notion of a universal empire subsequently penetrated into the consciousness of the Jewish and the Greek races following their contact with the ancient Chaldean civilization. In Daniel, chapter 2, four great epochs in the history of the world are predicted, after the

last of which God will set up his Kingdom on earth. Xenophon introduced the world-empire conception among the Greeks, though it never gained currency with them since it ran counter to the individualistic and democratic traditions of the race. The idea found more fertile soil among the Jews, by whom the Kingdom of God foretold by Daniel was interpreted to refer to the advent of a messiah-king destined to unite the world in a theocracy with Jerusalem as its capital and center.

The first world-conqueror who seems to have fulfilled the requisite conditions to the satisfaction of the various races was Alexander. No sooner was his career of conquest initiated than he began to be considered as the reappearing king of the ancient myth. This was especially true in Egypt, where he was regarded as the son of Jupiter Ammon, by Philip's wife Olympias, and hailed as the deliverer from the Persian yoke promised by the oracles. Alexander was not slow to seize upon this popular belief in his divinity and his mission as a subduer of the peoples and extend it beyond the borders of Egypt in support of his ever expanding schemes of conquest.¹ The Jews likewise, who, in accordance with the old Babylonian myth, had in their earlier legends seen in Solomon the expected pacifier of the earth, welcomed Alexander as their messiah-king. Their geographical position between the Egyptians and the Asiatic peoples had made of them the football of these races, and as a result of long periods of oppression the spirit of prophecy had early been aroused among them. They had just witnessed Alexander overwhelm in a brief space the empire of the Persians and lay low at one stroke the power of Egypt. They saw in consequence in the subduer of the hereditary enemies the founder of the world-empire and the pacifier of the peoples whose advent had been predicted in the Book of Daniel. Among the Greeks, also, Alexander was deemed destined to play a rôle analogous to that of the messiah-king of the Hebrews.

A syncretism of the age-old myths of the oriental races of Asia Minor resulted from the meteoric career of the youthful conqueror. Alexander immediately began to be invested with the traits formerly attributed to Sargon, Nimrod, Nebuchadnezzar, and the messiah-king whom the Jews had been awaiting since the time of Solomon. Thus there began to center around him a vast complex of legends and myths

¹ Arrian, *The Anabasis of Alexander*, *passim*.

whence soon an extensive body of literature arose which at first consisted in letters dealing with particular aspects of his fabulous exploits, such as the famous letter from him to Aristotle recounting the wonders of India, and which eventually assumed the form of romances.¹

The old popular beliefs maintained themselves by the side of this new literary tradition. The later apocalyptic books of Elias,² Daniel, and pseudo-Methodius repeat the prophecy of a king who was to bring peace to earth, and the pseudo-Methodius adds that his name had once filled the world.³ The brilliant exploits of Alexander were still alive in the minds of men, and his return was expected in fulfilment of the prophecy. Emperor-worship had its origin in the Roman provinces of Asia Minor. Supported as well by the oriental belief in the divinity of kings as by the Alexander legend, it eventually became established, in spite of its discouragement by Augustus, in the provinces of the western Roman Empire, and many of the later emperors saw in themselves the returned Macedonian king.⁴ From the twin streams of popular belief and literary tradition the primitive myth was transmitted to the Middle Ages,⁵ when it found political expression in the Holy Roman Empire of Charlemagne, philosophical expression in Dante's *De Monarchia*, and literary expression in the romances.

The purpose of this paper is to trace the literary history of the motif of world-conquest, whose origin and history has just been briefly sketched, in its direct line of descent. The motif frequently recurs in the pseudo-Callisthenes,⁶ a romance marking the climax of a literary

¹ See on this Franz Kämpers, *Alexander der Grosse und die Idee des Weltimperiums in Prophetie und Sage* (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1901), pp. 2-48. Kämpers' interesting study entirely disregards the aspect of the question treated in this article.

² This book was composed in Egypt in the period of confusion following the downfall of the emperor Valerian in 260 A.D. It predicts as at hand the return of Alexander who shall restore order to the empire. A curious example of the re-emergence of this old belief is found in the career of David Joris, the Anabaptist leader in Holland of the first half of the sixteenth century. Basing his claims on the apocalyptic books, especially that of Elias, he claimed he was the universal dominator whose advent they had predicted. See A. Jundt, *Histoire du panthéisme populaire au moyen âge et au seizième siècle* (1875), pp. 163-97.

³ See Kämpers, *op. cit.*, p. 24, on these apocalyptic predictions.

⁴ See J. Toutain, *Culte patens dans l'empire romain* (1907-20), *passim*; also E. Beurlier, *Essai sur le culte rendu aux empereurs romains* (1890), p. 15.

⁵ It is preserved chiefly in the body of prophecies attributed to the Tiburtine Sybil (Kämpers, *op. cit.*, p. 25).

⁶ See Ernest A. Wallis Budge, *The History of Alexander the Great, Being the Syriac Version of the pseudo-Callisthenes* (English translation and notes) (1889), Book I, chaps. 3, 7, 11, 16, 17, 19, 34, 38; Book III, chap. 1.

tradition whose end was to exalt Alexander from a Greek hero into the national hero of the East, and to invest him with the dignity and the attributes of a world-ruler. It assumes its most typical form in the letter of Alexander to Darius (i. 38):

Thou hast also sent me a whip and a ball and a box of gold. Now though I know that thou hast sent them to me in mockery, yet I have accepted them as a good omen, an augury of victory, and a prophecy of the gods. I have received the whip, and as chief and head of kings I will smite and subdue with my weapons all my enemies. As for the round ball it is a sign that I shall hold the whole world; for the world is round and resembles a sphere exactly. . . .

The earliest date assigned to the pseudo-Callisthenes, the only extant Greek romance of Alexander, is about 200 A.D. But the legends contained in it, as already indicated, go back for the most part to a very remote antiquity, and the numerous letters incorporated in it undoubtedly were current some hundreds of years before. It is from these letters accordingly, or possibly from some earlier romance no longer extant, that Plutarch got the idea for the celebrated passage in his *Life of Pyrrhus* (chap. 14), in which the world-conquest motif occurs, in a conversation between Pyrrhus and his trusted counselor, Kineas. It seems more than a coincidence that in this conversation so circumstantially reported almost four hundred years after the death of Pyrrhus his proposed itinerary roughly corresponds with the western itinerary of Alexander in the pseudo-Callisthenes. One day Kineas thus spoke to Pyrrhus:

"Pyrrhus," said he, "the Romans are said to be good soldiers and to rule over many warlike nations. Now, if heaven grants us the victory over them, what use shall we make of it?" "You ask what is self-evident," answered Pyrrhus. "If we can conquer the Romans, there is no city, Greek or barbarian, that can resist us, and we shall gain possession of the whole of Italy, a country whose size, richness, and power no one knows better than yourself." Kineas then, after waiting for a short time, said, "O king, when we have taken Italy, what shall we do then?" Pyrrhus, not yet seeing his drift, answered, "Close to it Sicily invites us, a noble and populous island, and one which is very easy to conquer; for, my Kineas, now that Agathokles is dead, there is nothing there but revolution and faction, and the violence of party spirit." "What you say," answered Kineas, "is very probably true. But is this conquest of Sicily to be the extreme limit of our campaign?" "Heaven alone," answered Pyrrhus, "can give us victory and success; but these conquests would merely prove to us the stepping-stones to greater things. Who could refrain from

making an attempt upon Carthage and Libya when he was so close to them, countries which were all but conquered by Agathokles when he ran away from Syracuse with only a few ships? And if we were masters of these countries, none of the enemies who now give themselves such airs at our expense will dare to resist us." "Certainly not," answered Kineas, "with such a force at our disposal we clearly could recover Macedonia, and have the whole of Greece at our feet. And after we have made all these conquests, what shall we do then?" Pyrrhus, laughing, answered, "We will take our ease and carouse every day and enjoy pleasant conversation with one another." Having brought Pyrrhus to say this, Kineas asked in reply, "But what prevents our carousing and taking our ease now, since we have already at hand all those things which we propose to obtain with much bloodshed, and great toils and perils, and after suffering much ourselves and causing much suffering to others?"

The literary career of the Alexander legend, initiated by the pseudo-Callisthenes, was helped by the Latin translation of Julius Valerius, *Julii Valerii res gestae Alexandri Macedonis translatae ex Aesopo Graeco*, who is supposed to have lived about the third or fourth century A.D. His work was one of the sources of the *Itinerarium Alexandri*, composed toward the middle of the fourth century, through which the peoples of the west and northwest of Europe became acquainted with the fabulous history of Alexander. Another translation was made by Leo the Archpresbyter, entitled *Historia Alexandri regis Macedoniae, de proeliis*, which appeared for the first time in the eleventh century.¹ These two versions furnished the material and inspiration for a vast florescence from the twelfth century on of "histories" of Alexander in almost all the modern European languages, in which the motif of world-conquest continued to play its rôle, but of course the writers of these romances scarcely were aware of the original eschatological significance of the legend. The first of these "histories" was Albéric de Besançon's *Le Roman d'Alexandre*, which appeared before 1130 and whose source is to be looked for in Leo the Archpresbyter rather than in Julius Valerius. The motif is found in the *Historia de proeliis* i. 38:

Quia direxisti nobis curvam virgam et speram atque auream cantram,
intellego hoc per virgam curvam: curvantur ante me potentissimi reges; per

¹ See Budge, *op. cit.*, pp. liv-lv and notes, on this and subsequent Latin translations in the Middle Ages; to the editions given by Budge may be added Friedrich Pfister, *Der Alexanderroman des Archpresbyters Leo*, Heidelberg, 1913. Also Paul Meyer, *Alexandre le Grand* (2 vols.; 1886), Vol. I. In Vol. II Meyer has a study of the legend in medieval French literature.

speram rotundam intellego, quia tenebo rotunditatem totius mundi; per cantram auream me esse victoriam intellego et censum ab omnibus recipere, quia et a te, qui magnus es, ego, qui parvus sum, cantram auream recepi.

The passage is lost in Albéric's romance, but it occurs in Lamprecht's *Alexander* (ed. Karl Kinzel, Halle, 1884). In lines 13-14 Lamprecht acknowledges his indebtedness to Albéric:

Albertch von Bisinzo
der brähte uns diz lît zû.

Although Lamprecht did not slavishly translate his model, the presumption is conclusive from an examination of the *Alexander* romances that the passage from the German poem (ll. 1535-44), in which the world-conquest motif occurs, is a rendering of a similar passage in Albéric:

Den bal hât er mir gesant,
dâ mite hat er mir bekant,
daz iss alliz an mir sol stân,
daz der himel hat umbevan,
und ih hère sule werden
noh an diser erden
ubir alle di rîche
di sint in ertrîche,
und ubir alle di lant,
di ie wurden genant.

From the *Alexander* romances¹ the motif passed into the other romances of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, in which it became more and more stressed until it reached its highest literary development in the famous chapter of Rabelais.

The *Lancelot du Lac*, so far as the writer is aware, is the first indigenous French romance in which the motif appears. In the *Lancelot*, Galehaut, the young king of Sorelois and the Illes Loingtaines, conceives the idea of conquering "one hundred and fifty kings" and "the whole world." When he makes his first appearance in the romance he has already conquered thirty kingdoms and he wishes to add

¹ The motif is found without further development in all the *Alexander* romances the writer has been able to examine. See Heinrich Michelant, *Li Romans d'Alexandre par Lambert li Tors et Alexandre de Bernay* (1846), fols. 114 and 124, for its first occurrence in an extant French romance.

Logres to these before being crowned. Fortunately for Arthur, Lancelot prevails upon Galehaut, whose fast friendship he has won by his matchless prowess, to abandon this scheme. Galahaut agrees upon a year's truce with Arthur, and returns to his kingdom of Sorelois, accompanied by Lancelot. After a year Galehaut again invades Arthur's kingdom. On this occasion the truce is converted into a treaty, which is sealed by the admission of Galehaut to be one of the Knights of the Round Table. A second time Lancelot accompanies Galehaut to Sorelois. On their return thither they pass one day by a recently built castle, called Lorguellone Emprise, which Galehaut had designed to be Arthur's prison after his capture. It is on this occasion that Galehaut relates to Lancelot his scheme of world-conquest.

Certes biaux douls compains [he tells Lancelot] se vous savies comme de grant cuer il fut commenchies. Vous le diries bien. Car iou baoie a *conquerre tout le monde*. Se vous dirai une merveille dont iou ferai comme fols du dire. Nus beubans nest si haut montes qu'il ne soit aussi tost descendus.¹ Et iou avoie orgoel empris de trop grant desmesure. Dont laiens a moult grant partie. Car il a en cele baille et en cele tor C et L kerniaus tout par compte. Et iou avoie empris tant a conquerre que iou y metroie C et L roys dessous ma seignorie. Et quant iou lez avroie conquis si les ameneroie tous o moi en chest chastel. Et lors mi feroie couronner. Et par lonnour de moi portaissent tout couronne ensamble et iou y tenisse cort si grande et si haute comme a ma hauteche apartenist pour chou que tous li siecles parlast de moi apres ma mort. ...

Ha sire diex [said Lancelot to himself] comme chies homme me deust hair qui toutes ches choses li ai destorbees a faire. Si ai ce mest avis fait du plus viguerous homme del monde le plus lent. ...²

Whether from the Alexander romances alone, or also in conjunction with the *Lancelot*, and perhaps with Plutarch's *Life of Pyrrhus*, the motif passed into the Italian comic romances. In these it attains its most striking form in the *Orlando innamorato*. It occurs for the first time in Book I, xx, 44-46,³ in which Marfisa thus apostrophizes

¹ This of course is what happens in the case of Pyrrhus, of Agramante, and of Picrocholo. The rôle of Lancelot in this connection has an analogue in the rôle of Ruggiero in the *Orlando innamorato*. Also somewhat like Lancelot's function as mediator between Arthur and Galehaut is that of Parzival as mediator likewise between Arthur and Feirefis.

² H. O. Sommer, *The Vulgate Version of the Arthurian Romances* (1908-14), III, 210, 253; IV, 6-7.

³ It might be worth nothing that in stanza 20 of this same canto there is an allusion to the *Isole Lontane*, probably Galehaut's *Illes Loingtaines*. This would indicate not only Bojardo's familiarity with the story of Lancelot and Galehaut, which may be taken for

Rinaldo, whom she is besieging in a castle:

.....
 Poi che disfatta avrò la rocca a tondo
 Vo' pigliar guerra contra tutto' l mondo.
 Primo Gradasso voglio disertare,
 Ch'è Re del gran paese Sericano;
 Poi Agricane ando a ritrovare,
 E tutta Tartaria porto per mano.
 Indi in Ponente mi convien andare,
 E disfaro la Francia e Carlo Mano;
 Nanti a quel tempo levarmi di dosso
 Maglia, nè usbergo, nè piastra non posso.
 Chè fatto ho sagramento a Trivigante
 Non dispogliarmi mai di quest arnese,
 Insin che le provincie tutte quante,
 E castelli e cittadi non hò prese. ...

The motif is taken up again and greatly expanded in Book II, i. Agramante, the Saracen king, who, we learn in stanzas 30 and 36, is a descendant of Alexander,¹ summons to a consultation in his capital

granted, but that this story very likely was in his mind at the very moment when he introduced the motif of world-conquest in his romance.

Cf. with the passage from Bojardo, *Morgante maggiore*, XXV, 193-94. Marsilio, in addressing his vassals, says:

"Ma se ancor taglian pur le nostre spade
 Noi piglierem tutta Christianitade.
 Noi piglierem la Francia e la Borgogna,
 Inghilterra, la Fiandra e la Brettagna,
 La Normandia, Navarra e la Guascogna,
 La Piccardia, Provenza, e poi Lamagna;
 E basta solo a me, quel che bisogna,
 Conservar la mia sedia antica e magna,
 Il resto, imperii e regni si sia vostro;
 Chè senza voi son nulla, e tutto è vostro."

The motif occurs also in Wolfram's *Parzival*, Canto XV. When Parzival meets Feirefis for the first time the latter has under his command in his expedition against Arthur twenty-five armies recruited from as many kingdoms, which he has already conquered for the love of Sekundillë. In his enumeration of the rulers he has vanquished Feirefis calls out thirty-one names.

¹ Here might be brought together the indications pointing to the three possible sources of this incident. In stanza 21 it is said of Agramante's palace:

"Adornavano al muro ogni figura
 Però ch'ivi intagliata con gran gloria,
 Del Re Alessandro vi è tutta storia."

The story of Alexander as sketched in the canto tallies closely with the romances of Alexander. In the preceding note reference has been made to the allusion to the Illes Loingtaines, and hence to Galehaut's story in the *Lancelot*. In stanza 36, speaking of the motives of Alexander in conquering the whole world, Agramante says:

"Nè vi crediate, che Alessandro il grande,
 Vincesse il mondo, ne per star in festa,"

words which may possibly be an echo of Pyrrhus'.

of Biserta his thirty-two vassal kings in order to deliberate over an invasion which he is meditating of Charlemagne's kingdom with a view of extending the creed of Mohammed.¹ Branzardo, king of Bugia, tries to dissuade him by saying that this war will prove vain and baneful to him. King Sobrino exposes the difficulties of such an expedition. The soothsaying king of Garamanta prophesies the disasters that will overtake the Saracen hosts. Nevertheless, Agramante decides on war (stanzas 63-64) in these boastful words:

Signor, io pur voglio passare
In ogni modo contra a Carlo Mano
E voglio che ciascun debba venire,
Chè io soglio comandar, non obbedire.

Nè vi crediate, poi che la corona
Sarà di Carlo rotta e dissipata,
Aver riposo sotto mia persona.
Vinta che sia la gente battezzata,
Addosso gli altri el mio cor s'abbandona,
Fin che la terra hò tutto soggiogata.
Poiche battuto avrò tutta la terra
Ancor nel Paradiso io vo' far guerra.

Next we come to the *locus classicus* of this motif, *Gargantua* 33. Rabelais' essays in his turn the ancient theme, and with inimitable verve, with many comic and even grotesque enlivenments, for some of which he is indebted to Plutarch, he succeeds in pouring new life into it, and expanding it into a tableau of epic amplitude.

Picrochole, intoxicated with the flattery of his captains, forms the project of conquering the whole world—or at least that part of it worth conquering then. In pursuance of this grandiose scheme his army is to be divided into two parts. The first part, after annihilating Grandgousier's forces and subduing his kingdom, is to pass on into Spain and Africa, and, turning eastward, to conquer both littorals of the Mediterranean and everything in between. Reaching Asia, it is to subdue all of Asia Minor, then turn back and end its labors with the

¹ Galehaut has already conquered thirty kings when he attacks Arthur; Felois has under his sway twenty-five kingdoms and enumerates thirty-one rulers who have fallen under his lance; Agramante is the suzerain of thirty-two kings. These three numbers, which are nearly the same, would seem to indicate a relationship subsisting between these different variations of the same motif.

² The writer in his study, *The Influence of the Arthurian Romances on the Five Books of Rabelais* (University of California Press, 1926), chap. II, has shown that there were accessible to Rabelais most of the prior romances in which the motif occurs.

capture of Constantinople. The second half of the army is to conquer, in the meantime, Brittany first, then likewise turning towards the east, is to subdue the middle and northern half of Europe, and meet in Constantinople the first army, now on its way back from its Asiatic conquests.¹

A last echo of the motif is found in Corneille.

Rabelais' romance was quite popular in the first half of the seventeenth century.² In its first third it went through nine editions, though through five only in its last two-thirds; the old romances of chivalry were still in vogue;³ Alexander's personality and career aroused as al-

¹ Among those present at the meeting when this all-embracing scheme of conquest is adopted is an old "gentilhomme, esprouvé en divers hazars et vray routier de guerre" named Echephron. His character corresponds closely with that of Sobrino and may have been suggested by it. After listening in silence to this fantastic project, he remarks: "J'ay grand peur que toute ceste enterpryse sera semblable à la farce du pot au lait, duquel un cordouanier se falsait riche par resverie; puis le pot cassé, n'eut de quoy disner." With Echephron's warning cf. La Fontaine, *La Laitière et le pot au lait*, VII, 10:

"Le récit [Perrette's misadventure] en farce fut fait
Et on l'appela le Pot au lait.

Picrochole, Pyrrhus, la laitière, enfin tous. . ."

From Echephron's warning and La Fontaine's words it is clear that both Rabelais and La Fontaine by linking together the *pot au lait* motif: (a) the fantastic day-dream of a highly imaginative person (b) which is shattered in some whimsical manner, with the world-conquest motif: (a) a fantastic dream of universal conquest (b) which from one cause or another does not become translated into reality, recognized in all these stories two aspects of the same basic idea. The *pot au lait* motif has twice been admirably studied: by Max Müller, "On the Migration of Fables," *Contemporary Review*, 1870, and by A. Joly, "Sur deux fables de La Fontaine," *Mémoires de l'Académie de Caen* (1877), pp. 399-509. On the farces mentioned by Rabelais and La Fontaine see Petit de Julleville, *Répertoire du théâtre comique du moyen âge* (1886), pp. 311-12.

² Pierre Villey, *Marot et Rabelais* (1923), pp. 332-33, mentions the following admirers of Rabelais: Rénier and his imitators in satire, Clugnon and d'Esternod; Furetière; the libertine school: Lamoignon-Levayer, Naudet, Gassendi, Patin, and Cyrano de Bergerac; the burlesque school: Saint-Amant, Scarron, and d'Assoucy. In addition he mentions Molière, who borrowed not only many ideas from Rabelais, but also, as Brunetière has shown in the article, "La Philosophie de Molière," *Études sur l'histoire de la littérature française* (4th series, 1912), his philosophy of naturism; Racine, La Fontaine, and Mme de Sévigné. Villey should not have overlooked La Bruyère and Boileau.

³ In his *French Classicism* (1920), C. H. C. Wright says, on p. 138: "The seventeenth century classicism was absolutely unable to appreciate the spirit of the old medieval epic. The *chansons de geste* and the romances had disappeared, except insofar as in their prose form they were considered uncouth legends for which nobody, save unexpectedly Chapelein, had a good word." This statement is perhaps excessive. The old romances, in the forms which began to appear in print about 1478 and continued to appear far into the eighteenth century, were widely read in the first half of the seventeenth century, and if in the second half their popularity waned it was due to the competition of the romances of the school of Mlle de Scudéry. The writer is under the impression that the old romances are frequently mentioned by writers in the seventeenth century. Among others, Voture mentions with approbation the *Amadis de Gaule* in his *Épître à Monseigneur le Prince sur son retour d'Allemagne*. La Fontaine tells us in *Ballade VII* (*Regnier*, IX, 22) that *Perceval le Gallois* was one of the romances he read, and Boileau in *Épître XI* alludes to the *Maugis d'Aigremont*, the *Quatre fils Aymon*, and *L'hystoire d'Alexandre*.

ways a lively interest and admiration; Plutarch was widely read. From any or all of these sources Corneille may have secured the idea for the imaginative flight of the Infante, *Le Cid*, II, v, 529-52, in which she sees in Rodrigue a *nouveau conquérant* who will equal all the exploits of the *plus fameux guerriers*.

L'INFANTE

Si Rodrigue une fois sort vainqueur du combat,
Si dessous sa valeur ce grand guerrier s'abat,
Je puis en faire cas, je puis l'aimer sans honte.
Que ne fera-t-il point, s'il peut vaincre le comte!
J'ose m'imaginer qu'à ses moindres exploits
Les royaumes entiers tomberont sous ses lois;
Et mon amour flatteur déjà me persuade
Que je le vois assis au trône de Grenade,
Les Maures subjugués trembler en l'adorant,
L'Aragon recevoir ce nouveau conquérant,
Le Portugal se rendre, et ses nobles journées
Porter delà les mers ses hautes destinées;
Du sang des Africains arroser ses lauriers;
Enfin tout ce qu'on dit des plus fameux guerriers,
Je l'attends de Rodrigue après cette victoire,
Et fais de son amour un sujet de ma gloire.

LÉONOR

Mais, madame, voyez où vous portez son bras,
Ensuite d'un combat qui peut-être n'est pas.

L'INFANTE

Rodrigue est offensé, le comte a fait l'outrage;
Il sont sortis ensemble, en faut-il davantage?

LÉONOR

Eh bien ils se battront puisque vous le voulez;
Mais Rodrigue ira-t-il si loin que vous allez?

The passage from *Le Cid* seems to be a *donnée*, to be sure *en raccourci*, quite analogous with the famous consultation between Picrochole and his captains. Of course it is not possible to say with assurance that Rabelais inspired Corneille. However, the similarity in architectonics between Rabelais' chapter and the lines from Corneille, i.e. (a) a

vision of extensive conquests, and (b) a warning, would seem to indicate that if Corneille consciously had a model in mind it must have been the Rabelaisian romance.

In résumé, three points might be stressed. First, the idea of world-conquest goes back to the dawn of the race, where it is found in myths and is invested with an eschatological meaning; second, with the pseudo-Callisthenes it passes into literature and eventually loses all eschatological significance, but to offset this loss it progressively undergoes expansion under its new guise of a literary motif; third, it is a striking illustration of the viability of an idea and its ability to suffer change in response to the changing requirements of time.

N. H. CLEMENT

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
SOUTHERN BRANCH
LOS ANGELES

SOME OBSCURE POINTS IN THE LIFE OF SOR JUANA INÉS DE LA CRUZ

I

The biography of Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz is yet to be written. Though much has appeared on the subject, many things still remain unexplained. Material of the period in which she lived is very limited. The fact that she was a nun made her figure less in the works of her contemporaries than would otherwise have been the case, and the period of literary stagnation following her death contributed still further to the oblivion in which she rested. When interest in Sor Juana finally revived in Mexico, it was already too late to preserve the documents that existed in the convent of St. Jerome and elsewhere. The laws of reform and the final closing of convents and monasteries scattered books of inestimable value. It is possible, however, even at this remote date to glean a few facts from the meager material that has come down to us. The present article is an attempt to answer in the light of contemporary books and manuscripts a few questions asked over and over again by her many biographers.

One question often raised is: Why did Sor Juana go into a convent? Why did she not remain in the world where she was admired for her beauty and her mental attainments? It will be remembered that Juana became lady-in-waiting to the Marchioness of Mancera, whose husband was the Viceroy of Mexico from 1664 to 1673. Endowed with a pleasing personality and gifted with unusual talents, she quickly attracted powerful friends at court, and met the outstanding people of her time. One would naturally expect that her life would here reach its climax in a blaze of glory. But in 1667, when not quite sixteen, she suddenly retired from the court and entered a convent. Why?

Some of her biographers believe that she must have taken this step because of an unfortunate love affair. Amado Nervo says:

Dicen ... que cierto caballero ... se le adentró en el corazón, logrando inspirarle un gran afecto; añaden unos, que este gentilhomme estaba muy alto

para que Juana, hidalga, pero pobre, pudiese ascender hasta él; otros, que se murió en flor cuando iba ya a posarse sobre sus manos unidas la bendición que ata para siempre. Juana de Asbaje, inconsolable, buscó alivio en el estudio y en el retiro.¹

This romantic legend has long been connected with Juana's name. The story is based on nothing more substantial than the fact that her works contain a large number of love lyrics. This is insufficient evidence on which to build a case.

A few have accepted Juana's own explanation of the decisive change in her life and have declared that she entered a convent to find a place where she could devote herself to her intellectual interests. It must be remembered that she was one of the most unusual personalities developed in the New World, and is hardly to be judged by ordinary standards. José Vigil, one of the first to appreciate her remarkable personality, says:

Muchos se han ocupado en conjeturar que la resolución de Sor Juana para haber adoptado la vida monástica, puede haber procedido de un amor desgraciado. ... Yo creo, sin embargo, que tal opinión se apoya en un conocimiento imperfecto del carácter de la escritora mexicana.

Yo veo en Sor Juana uno de esos espíritus superiores, ... que son incapaces de sucumbir a debilidades vulgares.²

According to her own confession, she had been, from the age of three, a most enthusiastic devotee of learning. She had devoured any and every book that came within her reach. At the age of fifteen she had already established a reputation as the most learned woman in Mexico. That she sought refuge in her books because of a broken heart is impossible. It was because of her learning that she gained a position at the viceregal court. Her books were her first love, and they were probably one of the reasons that impelled her to seek the seclusion of a cloister.

One looks in vain for a religious motive underlying this important step in her life.³ She even hesitated because she was afraid that con-

¹ *Juana de Asbaje* (Madrid, 1910), p. 78.

² *Discurso pronunciado en la velada literaria que consagró el Liceo Hidalgo a la memoria de Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz* (Mexico, 1874), pp. 42-49.

³ For a discussion of this side of the question see Nemesio García Naranjo, "Biografía de Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz," *Anales del Museo Nacional de México, segunda época*, Vol. III, No. 1 (Mexico, 1906), pp. 567-68.

vent life would interfere with her intellectual labors. She herself says that she did not wish any

... ocupacion obligatoria, que embaraçasse la libertad de mi estudio, ni rumor de Comunidad, que impidiese el sossegado silencio de mis Libros. Esto me hizo vacilar algo en la determinacion, hasta que alumbrandome personas Doctas, de que era tentacion, la vencí con el favor Divino ...¹

The biographer of her confessor testifies that she hesitated before taking the step.

Se sintió llamada de Dios al retiro ... mas retardabale el parecerle cõdicion indispensable á las obligaciones de esse estado, aver de abandonar los libros, y estudios, en que desde sus primeros años tenia colocados todos sus carñios. Consultó su vocació, y temores con el Venerable Padre Antonio Nuñez ... Ya tenia el Padre noticia de las prendas, y dones singulares, que avia el cielo depositado en aquella niña ... y ... aprobò ... la vocacion ... animandola á sacrificar á Dios aquellas primeras flores de sus estudios, si conociesse, que le avian de ser estorvo à la perfeccion ...²

Juana knew that the religious state might interfere with her labors. In spite of this fact, however, she finally decided to become a nun. There must have been, then, another and a more powerful reason that caused her to take the veil. What was it?

Most of Juana's biographers have examined this point in her life with the eyes of the present instead of with the eyes of the past. To understand Juana's motives one must go back to the period in which she lived, and study the social conditions of her time. She lived in a most licentious age. A careful study of contemporary writers shows that moral conditions in Mexico were very bad. The presence of many races, of adventurers, of loose women and worse men brought about conditions that were possibly unequaled elsewhere in the world. How bad they were the following entry in a contemporary chronicle shows:

En 12 murió el Br. Antonio Calderón de Benavides, natural de Méjico, uno de los más singulares clérigos que ha tenido este arzobispado: sobre ser muy galán, de muy linda cara y muy rico, fué constante opinión que se conservó virgen.³

¹ "Respuesta de la poetisa a la muy ilustre Sor Philotea de la Cruz." *Fama y obras posthumas* (Barcelona, 1701), p. 18. References hereafter will be to this edition.

² Juan de Oviedo, *Vida y virtudes del Venerable Padre Antonio Nuñez de Miranda* (Mexico, 1702), p. 133.

³ Antonio de Robles, "Diario de sucesos notables," *Documentos para la historia de Méjico, primera serie*, Vol. III (Mexico, 1853), under date of July 12, 1668.

Had this not been an astonishing fact, the chronicler would not have taken the pains to record it. The male element of the population was under no restraint (even the priesthood was no exception) and roamed at will, preying on society. Not only immorality, but depravity and bestiality reigned. Things came to such a pass that the Inquisition brought the attention of the civil government to this state of affairs. In a letter written by the inquisitors in 1664 we read:

... vemos de tres ó cuatro años á esta parte en las causas que han ocurrido, principalmente de religiosos, que se halla comprehendido en este crimen mucho número de personas eclesiásticas y seculares ... si á este cáncer no se pone remedio, ... parece muy dificultoso que después lo pueda tener. ... si el Santo Oficio no lo remedia, la justicia seglar no parece que ha de ser suficiente.¹

The civil government, however, refused to interfere. The church was therefore forced to devise ways and means of combating this evil. If they could not fight it through the men, they could fight it through the women. By building convents and houses of refuge and putting women in them they hoped to improve matters somewhat, and protect women at the same time.

In all of this the attitude of the church toward women was medieval. They were looked upon as an ever present source of temptation to man. Ecclesiastics who did not wish to be tempted avoided them. The biographer of Francisco de Aguiar y Seixas, Archbishop of Mexico from 1682 to 1698, says:

... ponderaba [su Ill^{ma}] quã necesario era para conservar la castidad el recato de la vista; encargaba que no se visitassen mugeres sin grave causa, y aun entonces, quando era necesaria la visita, no se les avia de mirar à la cara ... le oyamos decir algunas vezes, que si supiera avian entrado algunas mugeres en su casa, avia de mandar arrancar los ladrillos que ellas avian pisado ...

Y este genero de orror, y aversion a las mugeres fue cosa de toda su vida, predicando siempre contra sus visitas, y sus galas ... Tenia por beneficio grande de Dios el aver sido corto de vista.²

Juana's confessor, Antonio Núñez, was just as discreet. His biographer says that his motto was "Con las Señoras gran cautela en los ojos, no dexarme tocar, ni besar la mano, ni mirarlas al rostro, o

¹ José Toribio Medina, *Historia del tribunal del Santo Oficio de la Inquisición de México* (Santiago de Chile, 1905), pp. 321-22. Part of this document is unprintable.

² José Lezamis, *Breve relacion de la vida, y muerte del Doctor D. Francisco de Aguiar y Seyzas*, Mexico, 1699. Not paged. See chapter entitled: "De su castidad, mortificacion, y penitencia."

trage, ni visitar a ninguna" And that he might not be tempted, he says: "Por las calles iba siēpre con los ojos en el suelo, de la misma manera estaba en las visitas Por evitar qualquiera ocasion de que ... le tocassen, ò besassen las manos ... las llevaba siempre cubiertas con el manto."¹ Many similar instances could be cited.

It was in such a world that Juana grew up. On the one hand, extreme license; on the other, extreme prudery. Out of such a state of society the famous *Redondillas* were born. Is it not this very attitude and these very conditions that she challenged so boldly in "Hombres necios, que acusáis a la mujer sin razón"? Is it not the terrible dissoluteness of the men of her time that she epitomizes with the words "Juntáis diablo, carne y mundo"?

To remedy this state of affairs, the church began to build *recogimientos*. Some of these were for *mujeres malas*; others for widows, orphans, and single women. The Bishop of Puebla, Manuel Fernández de Santa Cruz, built a number of such *recogimientos* in his diocese, but they would not accommodate all the women clamoring for admission. His biographer writes:

Franqueadas las puertas de su Palacio empezaron à entrar por ellas en busca de su Pastor ... muchas mugeres que deseaban guardar intacta la Flor de la pureza, que hasta entonces habian conservado, ... pero recelaban timidas perderla ò por ser muy pobres, ò por ser por hermosas, muy perseguidas.²

Of the Bishop's efforts on their behalf the same writer says:

Compuesta ya en la forma dicha la Casa de las recogidas, determinò el Señor Don Manuel aplicar el remedio que le pedia la pureza de pobres nobles, y hermosas Doncellas para su resguardo; y aunque yà en la Ciudad avia un Collegio de Virgines, en que pudo assegurar algunas de las que reconocio en mayor peligro, assi por la corta capacidad de dicho Collegio, como por el numero de las pretendientes, tan crecido, que le viniera estrecho el mas espacioso Claustro, discurrió con su animo generoso, comprar la possession de cierto sitio, para eregir a las Flores de la Virginidad un Collegio; pero como cada dia escuchaban sus atentos oydos mas y mas clamores de pobres Doncellas, se hallò obligado à formarles dos Collegios, ò cerrados Huertos, donde negadas à el examen de la ossadia, conservassen intactos los candòres de su virginal pureza.

De los dos dichos Collegios, como de floridos Huertos, salieron muchas Doncellas a florecer transplantadas en Monasterios religiosos, en que man-

¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 153-54.

² Miguel de Torres, *Dechado de príncipes eclesiasticos* (Puebla, 1716), p. 123.

teniendo el credito de la virtud, subieron cō presurosos pasos à la cumbre de la perfecciō; otras sugetandose à las coyundas de el Matrimonio desempeñaron bien la buena educacion ...¹

This was the state of affairs in the diocese of Puebla. In Guadaluaxara and other places conditions were the same. How about Mexico City? The biographer of Domingo Pérez de Barcia says:

No puede negarse la heroicad, y grandeza de la obra de enclaustrar mugeres, que voluntariamente se retiren, huyendo del Mundo, y sus peligros, para no caer en sus lazos, ni dār en sus precipios, viendose expuestas, yā por la libertad en que viven, yā por la necesidad en que se hallan à vender su hermosura, à costa de su honestidad, valiendose de sus cuerpos para perdicion de sus almas. De la grandeza de esta obra se via privada esta Ciudad de Mexico, y tan necesitada de ella, quanto se atendia de mugeres mas abastecida, que no pudiendo todas entrar en Monasterios, se lloraban en el siglo en manifestos peligros ...²

He goes on to say that various attempts were made to establish *recogimientos*, but lack of funds always prevented the realization of the project. A Jesuit, Luis de San Vitores, even wrote a book on the need of a *refugio*, and³ finally, with the help of Father Xavier Vidal, a house big enough to accommodate six hundred women was built. But money was lacking for the maintenance of the place, and so Payo Henríquez de Ribera, Archbishop of Mexico from 1668 to 1680, was obliged to give the house to the Bethlehemites for a hospital.⁴

During this time Juana was living at the viceregal court in *la publicidad del siglo*. She was the talk of the town because of her brilliant attainments. What her situation was she describes clearly in *Los empeños de una casa*:

Era de mi patria toda
El Objecto venerado
De aquellas adoraciones,
Que forma el comun aplauso,
.....
Llegò la supersticion
Popular à empeño tanto
Que ya adoraban Deydad
El Idolo que formaron.
.....

¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 124-25, 150. Also see José Gómez de la Parra, *Panegyrico funeral de Manuel Fernandes de Santa Cruz* (Puebla, 1699), p. 64.

² Julián Gutiérrez Dávila, *Vida y virtudes de Domingo Peres de Barcia* (Madrid, 1720), pp. 27-28.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 30.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 31.

Que aviendo sido al principio
Aquel culto voluntario,
Llegò despues la costumbre,
Favorecida de tantos,
A hazer como obligatorio,
El festejo cortesano,

.....

Sin temor en los concursos
Defendia mi recato
Con peligro del peligro,
Y con el daño del daño.

.....

Mis padres en mi mesura,
Vanamente assegurados,
Se descuidaron comigo:
Que dictamen tan errado.¹

She was a curiosity, a veritable *monstruo de la naturaleza*, and must have been the object of persistent and in many cases unwelcome attentions. If ordinary women were in danger, the beautiful Juana Inés certainly was. To be sure, she had the protection of the Viceroy. But how long would the Marquis of Mancera retain that office? In a change of administration what would be her fate? Her family was poor, and besides, in her day the chimney-corner for the spinster member of the family had not yet been heard of. Moreover, she was a *criolla* living at a Spanish court. She was therefore at its mercy. That her position was not safe, we may gather from the biography of her confessor:

... el Padre Antonio ... aviendo conocido ... lo singular de su erudicion junto con no pequeña hermosura, atractivos todos á la curiosidad de muchos, que desearian conocerla, y tendrian por felicidad el cortejarla, solia decir, ¿no podia Dios embiar asote mayor a aqueste Reyno, que si permitiesse, que Juana Ines se quedara en la publicidad del siglo.²

He goes on to tell why she left the convent of St. Joseph and adds: " ... le fue forçoso salir, y buscar otro puerto en donde atendiendo cõ menos peligros de enfermedad ... se viesse libre de las muchas olas que la amenazaban."³ Her biographer, Father Calleja, expresses the same idea. She realized, he says, that " ... la buena cara de una muger pobre es una pared blanca donde no hay necio, que no quiera echar

¹ Segundo tomo de las obras de Soror Juana Ines de la Cruz (Sevilla, 1692), Act I.

² Juan de Oviedo, *op. cit.*, p. 133.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 134-35.

su borron: que aun la medida de la honestidad sirve de riesgo, porque ay ojos, que en el yelo deslizan mas:"¹ And she herself says of this step: "... con todo, para la total negacion que tenia al Matrimonio, era lo menos desproporcionado y lo mas decente, que podia elegir en materia de la seguridad ... de mi salvacion."²

It was, undoubtedly, necessary for her to retire from public life at court. There was no *recogimiento* where she might live until she could decide definitely on her future occupation. She was, therefore, practically forced to choose convent life, or be at the mercy of the world. Juana Inés was, perhaps, even lucky to get into a convent, for there was not room for all who applied. With the powerful influence, however, of the Viceroy and of Father Núñez, a haven was found for her. The influence of the latter in this decisive step is not to be overlooked. He it was who finally persuaded her and hastened the ceremony lest the devil should tempt, meanwhile, his beloved Juana Inés.

We may safely conclude that the deep, underlying reason for Juana's retirement from the world is to be found in the social conditions of her time. She was persuaded to take the step, too, in the hope of being somewhat favorably situated for a continuation of her intellectual labors. And when she came under the influence of that powerful *norte de la Inquisición*, the pious Father Núñez, she accepted his advice and took the veil. That she tried convent life a second time shows what serious and what pressing reasons she had for taking the step.

II

Another question recently brought to the fore is whether Juana should properly be called Juana de Asbaje or Juana Ramírez. Amado Nervo, writing in 1910, called her Juana de Asbaje. Fernández del Castillo, writing in 1920,³ calls her Juana Ramírez, and insists that this is correct, since she herself signed her name that way. He tries to

¹ "Aprobación," *Fama y obras posthumas*.

² *Fama y obras posthumas*, p. 18. As for matrimony, it is possible that the Viceroy had already selected a husband for her. This seems to have been the regular procedure, at any rate, and Juana had no reason to suppose that he would not select one in her case. Doña Oliva Merletti, a lady-in-waiting at the court, entered the Capuchin order in preference to marrying a man selected for her by the Marquis of Mancera. See Ignacio de Peña, *Treño mexicano en el convento de Capuchinas* (Madrid, 1726), p. 213.

³ Francisco Fernández del Castillo, *Doña Catalina Xudres Marcayda* (Mexico, 1920).

prove that she was related to the Hernán Cortés family on her mother's side, her mother's name being Isabel Ramírez de Santillana. Speaking of her name, he says:

Sor Juana, según el uso actual, debería de llevar el apellido Asvaje, que era el de su padre, ... pero en aquella época cada hijo llevaba, diferente apellido, lo que origina no pocos trastornos en las investigaciones genealógicas; de suerte que, aun cuando le correspondía el apellido Asvaje, como ella firmaba Juana Ramírez, ese es el suyo verdadero, con el que se le debe mencionar, y así consta en su retrato que se conserva en el Museo Provincial de Toledo ... ¹

The inscription on the picture mentioned reads: "En el siglo fue conocida por D.^a Juana Ramirez (por q̃ assi firmaba)."² A careful study of this document shows that it is incorrect on two points. The author of the inscription goes on to say: "Tomo el Havito de Religiosa en el Convento dl Eximio D.^f de la Iglesia S.^a Geronimo de esta Ciud. de Mex.^{co} ã 24 de Feb.^o de 1668 a.^a a los 17. de su edad" This is inaccurate as to her age, for she was only sixteen. Another error in the inscription is the following: "... haviendo vivido 44 años, 5 meses, 5 dias, y 5 horas." It should read: "43 años, 5 meses, etc." It seems possible, therefore, that the writer was also mistaken in regard to her signature. But Fernández del Castillo goes on to say:

Se podría objetar que el retrato de la religiosa que se conserva en Toledo es muy posterior a la muerte de la poetisa, pero habiendo sido sacado según datos tomados del Convento de San Jerónimo en donde vivió, es claro que las religiosas sabrían cual era el verdadero nombre de Sor Juana.³

It is, in fact, more than likely that in the convent of St. Jerome she was always thought of as Juana Ramírez, rather than as Juana de Asbaje. It is a well-known fact that her mother was a *criolla* and her father a Spaniard (Basque). As Juana Ramírez she was a *criolla*. As Juana de Asbaje she was Spanish. It is also a well-known fact that in Mexico at that time the only avenues of preferment open to the *criollos* were the university and the church. In fact, so strong were the *criollos* becoming in the church during the seventeenth century that by the time of the Marquis of Mancera the Augustinians were demanding that all candidates for admission to the order be native

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 83.

² For a copy of this document see Amado Nervo, *op. cit.*, opp. p. 96.

³ *Loc. cit.*

born.¹ This caused constant bickering between the two factions. The convent of St. Jerome belonged to the Augustinian order. To enter it, therefore, one had to be a native of New Spain. That such was the case the following passage shows:

Estaba yá para tomar el Avito cierta doncella, en el Convento de S. Geronimo, y no teniendo la dote para ello, entraba con nombramiento de algunos, que en dicho convento ay dotados; pero al fin, se advirtió faltarle a esta doncella una de las condiciones, que la fundacion pedia; conviene, a saber, el que sean nacionales de Mexico, y esta no lo era; por lo qual huvosele de impedir su entrada ...²

When one considers that this was a foundation for *criollos*, that the hatred between the natives and the governing class was increasing, and that toward the end of the seventeenth century and the beginning of the eighteenth this hatred was becoming more and more open, one can well understand why the nuns of St. Jerome might have given out that Sor Juana was Juana Ramírez. To date, however, no such signature has been found.

There is evidence, on the other hand, that while she was at the viceregal court she went by the name of Asbaje. In 1668 Diego de Ribera published a poem by Doña Juana Ynés de Asuage.³ In November of the preceding year Juana had left the convent of St. Joseph. If she was known as Juana de Asbaje in 1668 she must have been so called before she entered the convent in August, 1667. In other words, this was certainly her name at court. It was, undoubtedly, to her advantage to go by her Spanish name as lady-in-waiting to the Vicereine. Whether she had been known as Juana Ramírez before she went to court nobody knows. It is possible that the *criollos* knew her by that name. However, in the absence of more definite proof favoring the name Ramírez it seems preferable to continue to call her Asbaje since we know that she actually went by that name in 1668.

An easier question to answer is: Which name did she herself prefer? In the *Libro de Professions* of the convent of St. Jerome she wrote: "Yo soror Ju^a ynes de la chruz hija legima de don p^o de

¹ Vicente Riva Palacio, *México a través de los siglos* (Mexico: Ballesca y Cía), II, 669.

² Julián Gutiérrez Dávila, *op. cit.*, pp. 351-52.

³ This appeared in *Poética descripción de la pompa plausible que admiró esta Ciudad de Mexico en la Dedicacion de su Templo* (Mexico, 1668). This is cited by Medina, *La Imprenta en México* (8 vols.; Santiago de Chile, 1907-12), No. 1004. A copy of this work exists in the Biblioteca Palafoxiana in Puebla, Mexico.

asvaje y bargas machuca Y de isabel ramires, etc."¹ It will be noticed that she signs her father's name in full. This seems to indicate that at that time she preferred that name. Vargas Machuca is an honored name in the annals of Spanish arms, and the name Asbaje aligned her with the Basques, who must be credited with notable achievements in the New World. Was she a *criolla* or a Spaniard at heart? Her works show both tendencies. With their publication, however, she seems to have put herself definitely on the Spanish side. Her second volume, which appeared in Seville in 1692, was dedicated to Don Juan de Orue y Arbieto, a Basque. In that dedication she says: "... siendo, como soy Rama de Vizcaya, y Vm. de sus nobilísimas familias de las Casas de Orue y Arbieto, vuelvan los frutos à su tronco, y los arroyuelos de mis discursos tributen sus corrientes al Mar à quiẽ reconocen su Origẽ." In some of her works she even used the Basque dialect. She was proud of her Basque ancestry. This, too, argues in favor of the name Asbaje.

III

Another question that has been discussed is: Why did Juana, when she was at the height of her fame, renounce fame? It seems impossible at first glance that Sor Juana, having made herself famous, having earned the title of *la décima musa*, and having published in Spain two volumes of poetry, should suddenly renounce her intellectual labors, her mathematical and musical instruments, her library of four thousand volumes, and everything that for her made life worth living to devote herself to a life of cilices and scourges, fasts and vigils. She had lived in the convent of St. Jerome a quarter of a century. She had lived on terms of intimacy with the most prominent people of the city. In Spain she had been the object of dozens of laudatory poems and articles. But for the second time in her life she suddenly retired from the world, and this time it was to lead the life of an ascetic, the life of a martyr. Why?

The blame for this strange renunciation has been generally laid at the door of the Bishop of Puebla, Manuel Fernández de Santa Cruz. A few attributed it to the Inquisition or to Father Núñez. Others

¹ This manuscript is now in my possession. González Obregón was the first to reproduce any part of it. See *El Renacimiento, segunda época* (Mexico, 1894), pp. 237-38.

have frankly declared it inexplicable. To understand the situation, let us go back and review briefly the preceding period in the life of Sor Juana.

In the year 1680 a new viceroy, the Count of Paredes, came to Mexico. The *cabildo* of the cathedral asked Juana to write a poem for one of the *arcos* erected in his honor. Placed thus in the limelight, it is not surprising that a friendship developed between Juana and the Count and Countess of Paredes. This was the beginning of a brilliant and happy period for the gifted nun. Her new patrons encouraged her in her literary ambitions. It was for them that she wrote some of her best works. During their residence in New Spain, Sor Juana devoted much more time than the church approved of to worldly things. The Viceroy and his wife were frequent visitors at the convent. The nun became very popular in court circles, and was the object of many attentions, of gifts, of letters, of poems. She was in constant contact with the world. She was in such demand socially that she could hardly find time for her literary work. In the spring of 1688, however, her patrons returned to Spain. With their departure Juana lost her most powerful protectors in New Spain. Though on friendly terms with the Conde de Galve, viceroy from 1688 to 1696, there was not the strong personal bond that bound her to his predecessor. It is to the Countess of Paredes that we owe the first volume of Juana's works.

The period just sketched had disastrous consequences for Sor Juana. Her worldly life brought down upon her the criticism of the more sinister, the more fanatical element in the church. Father Núñez broke off all relations with her. Oviedo says in this connection:

Bien quisiera el Padre Antonio que tan singulares prendas se dedicassen solo á Dios, y que entendimiento tan sublime tuviesse solo por pasto las divinas perfecciones del Esposo que avia tomado. Y aunque se han engañado muchos, persuadidos, á que el Padre Antonio le prohibia á la Madre Juana el exercicio decente de la Poesia sanctificado con los exemplos de grandes siervos, y siervas de Dios, estorbavale si quáto podia la publicidad, y continuadas correspondencias de palabra, y por escrito con los de fuera; y temiendo que el affecto a los estudios por demasiado no declinasse al extremo de vicioso, y le robasse el tiempo que el estado santo de la Religion pide de derecho ... le aconsejaba con las mejores razones que podia, á que agradecida al cielo por los dones conque la avia enriquecido olvidada del todo de la tierra pusiera sus pesamientos ... en el mismo cielo.

Viendo pues el Padre Antonio, que no podia conseguir lo que deseaba, se retiró totalmente de la asistencia à la Madre Juana ...¹

Father Núñez was one of the most powerful ecclesiastics in New Spain. Because of his learning he was popularly known as the "encyclopedia of the Jesuits." There is plenty of evidence to show that all important cases of the Inquisition passed through his hands. The break,² therefore, between him and Sor Juana was a most serious matter. The fact that Father Núñez disapproved of her conduct must have ranged against her some of the other intolerant churchmen of the time, such men as José Vidal and the Archbishop himself.

The latter was something of a fanatic. His character was very different from that of his predecessor, the much esteemed Fray Payo in whose honor Juana wrote several poems. Her relations with Aguiar y Seixas must have been quite different, for she never mentions him. If the biographer of the Archbishop is to be trusted, there was probably a good reason why he and Juana were not on intimate terms. He says:

Para remediar los pecados importa mucho el quitar las rayzes de ellos: en esto ponía el Señor Arçobispo mucho cuydado. Una causa muy principal de muchos pecados, suelen ser las comedias, y fiestas de toros; por lo qual aborrecia mucho su Ill.^{ma} estas, y otras semejantes fiestas, à que concurren muchos de todo genero de personas, hombres y mugeres. Predicaba con gran acrimonia contra estos toros, y comedias, y los estorvò siempre que pudo: quando andabamos en las visitas mandaba que en las solemnidades de los Santos, aunque fuesen titulares, no huviesse semejantes fiestas; ...

Otro medio de que usaba el Señor Arçobispo para desterrar los vicios, y plâtar las virtudes, era el procurar acabar con los libros profanos de comedias, y otros; y repartir libros devotos. Quando venimos de España, truxo unos mil y quinientos libros, que se intitulan *Consuelo de pobres*, que tratan con especialidad de la limosna, para repartirlos entre los ricos, y trocarlos por otros libros malos; y así lo hazia. Persuadia à los libreros, que no tomassen libros de comedias; y trocò con algunos de ellos todos quantos tenían por los dichos arriba de consuelo de pobres: y luego quemaba los de las comedias: ...³

That Aguiar was a bitter enemy of the worldly life of the times is shown by the following extract from a contemporary:

Il Lunedì 27. dovea andare la Signora V. Regnia, con suo marito, in S. Agostino de las Cuevas, invitati dal Tesoriere della Casa della moneta; ma poi

¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 134, 136.

² It is impossible to fix the exact date of this rupture. It must have taken place at some time during Juana's greatest worldly activity, i.e., between 1680 and 1690.

³ *Op. cit.*, chapter entitled: "De la oracion, contemplacion, amor de Dios y del proximo del Señor Arçobispo."

se n'astenero, per far cosa grata a Monsignor Arcivescovo, il quale biasimava quel passatempo, como scandaloso.¹

Life in Mexico changed under his administration. It took on a gloomier aspect. Many festival days were abolished,² and an effort was made to reform the habits and customs of the people.

Under such an archbishop Juana passed the last days of her life. That Juana wrote *comedias* and even published them must have been a crime in his eyes. In Mexico during his administration no *comedias* and almost no secular verse were finding their way into print.³ Conditions in Mexico were quite different from what they were in Spain, though even in Spain a movement which opposed the theater was gaining ground. Conditions in Spain, nevertheless, were liberal as compared with those that obtained in New Spain. What the difference was becomes plain when we consider that the books of Sor María de Jesús de Ágreda which were taken off the Index abroad (even the celebrated *Mística Ciudad de Dios* being cleared by the Pope)⁴ were prohibited in Mexico by an edict of the Inquisition in 1690.⁵ Moreover, the fact that Sor Juana's works appeared in Spain is significant. This was due to the strict censorship⁶ on books that existed in New Spain, rather than to other difficulties of publication such as expense and scarcity of paper. The fact that of all her works the most popular one in Mexico was a religious work, the many times reprinted *Ofrecimientos para un Rosario de quince Misterios*, is also highly significant. One is forced to the conclusion that the publication of her collected works would have been impossible in Mexico. The fact that she published them in Spain must have widened the breach that was gradually

¹ Gio. Francesco Gemelli Careri, *Giro del mondo, sesta parte* (Naples, 1700), p. 169. He visited Mexico in 1697.

² Francisco Aguilar y Seixas, *Edicto pastoral sobre los días festivos*, Mexico, 1688.

³ Less than 25 per cent of the books printed in Mexico City were secular in character. These figures are based on tables developed from Medina, *La imprenta en México*, for the period between 1682 and 1698. From 1666 to 1682 about 32 per cent of the books were secular. These figures are only approximate since Medina is not complete, and besides, some of the material of the period has, undoubtedly, been lost. Of these secular works some were official documents, some were *gacetas*, and a few were scholarly works. There was very little of a purely literary character.

⁴ Emilia Pardo Bazán, "Prólogo," *Vida de la Virgen María según Sor María de Jesús de Ágreda* (Barcelona, 1899), p. 7.

⁵ Antonio de Robles, *op. cit.*, under date of September 24, 1690.

⁶ The censorship in Mexico during the seventeenth century has not yet been studied. For methods used during the sixteenth see Francisco Fernández del Castillo, "Libros y libreros del siglo XVI," *Publicaciones del archivo general de la nación*, Vol. VI (Mexico, 1914).

establishing itself between her and the church. The first volume of her works appeared in Madrid in 1689. It contains a large number of secular poems: lyrics of love and friendship, satirical verse, and burlesque poems in the Italian manner. Whether the book came back to Mexico I do not know. But enough information about it must have traveled back to make things slightly uncomfortable for Juana.

At about this same time Sor Juana committed another crime in the eyes of the church. She wrote a refutation of a sermon preached in Lisbon by the brilliant Jesuit, Antonio de Vieira. The latter had set up his own opinion in opposition to that of the Church Fathers, Aquinas, Augustine, and Chrysostom. Juana defended the Church Fathers with logic and erudition. Her refutation found its way into the hands of Manuel Fernández de Santa Cruz. He had it published late in 1690,¹ together with a letter, the famous letter signed Sor Philotea de la Cruz. In it he said in part:

Para que V. md. se vea en este Papel de mejor letra, le he impresso, y para que reconozca los tesoros, que Dios depositò en su alma, y le sea, como mas entendida, mas agradecida pocas criaturas deben a su Magestad mayores talentos en lo natural, con que executa al agradecimiento, para que si hasta aqui los ha empleado bien ... en adelante sea mejor.

No es mi juicio tan austero Censor, que estè mal con los versos, en que V. md. se ha visto tan celebrada

No pretendo, segun este dictamen, que V. md. mude el genio, renunciando los Libros; si no que le mejore, leyendo alguna vez el de Jesu-Christo. ... Mucho tiempo ha gastado V. md. en el estudio de Filósofos, y Poetas; yà serà razon que se mejoren los Libros.²

This is the letter that has long been held responsible for Sor Juana's renunciation. It is quite clear from the letter that the Bishop did not really approve of her secular writings, but it is also clear that he did not ask her to give up her literary labors. All that he asked her to do was to devote herself to religious works. He was himself a lover of learning, and had during his youth written three books of commentary on the Scriptures. He is said to have bought many books for the Colegio de San Pablo in Pueblo. What gave the letter such force was the fact that it was printed along with the *Crisis*, and that

¹ Her refutation was reprinted under the title of "*Crisis de un Sermón*" in the second volume of her works.

² *Fama y obras posthumas*, pp. 2-4.

in it he asked her to pay less attention to *las rateras noticias del dia*. It amounted to a public censure.¹

Of the cause and effect of this letter, the biographer of the Bishop writes as follows:

Era muy celebrada en esta Nueva España la Madre Sor Juana Ines de la Cruz, ... assi por la grande capacidad, y soberano entendimiento de que Dios la havia dorado, como por la gracia de saber hazer y componer ... versos: con esta ocasion era visitada de muchas personas, y de las de primera clase: corria la fama por todas partes ... ; llegó la noticia à nuestro amantissimo Obispo ... , y ... conolido ... de q̄ un sujeto de tan relevantes prendas estubiera tan distraido, y combertido à las criaturas, ... resolvió escribirla la carta siguiente Tubo esta carta el deseado efecto²

More than two years were to elapse, however, before Juana's renunciation. It does not seem possible, then, that this letter was the cause of the step she took. It was another sign of the times, however, and a thorn in the flesh of the brilliant nun.

In March, 1691, Juana wrote an answer to the famous letter. Her letter is astonishingly frank. One wonders how she dared so reveal her innermost soul. Her answer could certainly have done nothing to mend matters.

Meanwhile, the *Crisis* was receiving wide publicity. In 1692 it was published in Mallorca. In the same year it was reprinted in the second volume of her works, and in the following year it appeared again in the second edition of that volume.³ It was received with great enthusiasm in Spain. Why did it arouse a storm of criticism in

¹ The signature, Philotea de la Cruz, is pregnant with meaning. The name itself means "lover of God." The Bishop pretended that the letter was written by a nun of that name in the convent of the Holy Trinity. There may have been a nun of that name. But why did the Bishop choose that name? One of his predecessors in the bishopric of Puebla, the famous Juan de Palafox y Mendoza, published in Madrid in 1659 a book called *Peregrinacion de Philotea al santo templo y monte de la Cruz*. He says it was written in imitation of a "Philotea Francesa" because it had seemed to him "no inutil emulacion, sino espiritual y santa: que ... otra Philotea Española instruyesse a las demas, con manifestarse humilde seguidora de la Cruz" The books of Palafox were very popular. It is probable that Fernández de Santa Cruz had this book in mind when he wrote Sor Juana. If so, the significance of the signature could not have been lost upon her.

² *Op. cit.*, pp. 416, 421. The 1722 edition says that it was her *estudio de libros profanos* that called forth the letter.

³ The subject of the *Crisis* was kept alive until 1731, when a defense of Father Vieyra's sermon, written by Sor Margarita Ignacia, a Portuguese nun, was translated into Spanish by Ifígo Rosende in a volume entitled *Vieyra impugnado*, published in Madrid.

Mexico? Was it heretical? It was so considered there. In her answer to the Bishop Juana wrote:

Si el crimen està en la Carta Athenagorica, fue aquella mas que referir sencillamente mi sentir ... ? ... Llevar una opinion contraria de Vieyra, fue en mi atrevimiento, y no lo fue en su Paternidad, llevarla contra los tres Santos Padres de la Iglesia? ... ni faltè al decoro, que à tanto varon se debe Ni toquè à la Sagrada Compañia en el pelo de la ropa; Que si creyera se avia de publicar, no fuera con tanto desaliño como fue. Si es (como dize el Censor) Heretica, porquè no la delata?¹

We gather from this that it was declared heretical. In Spain, however, Navarro Vélez, *Calificador del Santo Oficio*, declared that it contained nothing contrary to the faith.² That it was so strongly condemned in Mexico is due to the fact that conditions there were different. The Jesuits were all powerful. They were practically in control of the Inquisition. Father Vieyra was a Jesuit, and it was felt that the *Crisis* was an attack on that order. How Father Núñez felt about it one can easily guess. Juana had brought herself face to face with the Inquisition. At the time she wrote her reply she had not been brought to trial. No record has been found to show that she ever was. It is not likely that the Inquisition would have waited more than two years to do so. It does not seem possible, then, that it was directly responsible for her renunciation.

Did Juana, upon receiving the Bishop's letter, immediately stop writing about secular things? Not at all. Early in 1691 she wrote a *silva* celebrating a victory won by the *armada de Barlovento* against the French off the coast of Santo Domingo. This was published the same year by Carlos de Sigüenza y Góngora in his *Trofeo de la justicia española*. In 1692 she was still sending manuscripts abroad for the second edition³ of the second volume of her works. It seems likely that early in 1692 she was still writing some poetry and collecting it for that volume. Sometime in 1692 or 1693 she also wrote a poem thanking her newly found friends in Spain for the laudatory poems and articles which appeared in her second volume. This poem was never finished, and is probably her last work.

¹ *Fama y obras posthumas*, pp. 50-51.

² Juan Navarro Vélez, "Censura," *Segundo tomo de las obras de Soror Juana Ines de la Cruz*, Sevilla, 1692.

³ This edition, published in Barcelona in 1693, has on the title-page: "añadido en esta segunda impresion por su autora." It also contains some *villancicos* dated 1691.

Sor Juana's renunciation took place in 1693.¹ In March, 1691, when she wrote her answer to the Bishop, she was not yet ready for her great sacrifice. She still defended herself vigorously, claiming for herself the right to study. The letter is, in fact, a defense of the rights of women, a memorable document in the history of feminism. In the light of it, her renunciation is even more startling than it would be had the letter never been written. Yet in it she reveals, too, a struggle in which she was as a house divided against itself. What it was and how insidiously it undermined what a lifetime had built up, the following passage will make clear:

Pues aun falta por referir lo mas arduo de las dificultades;—faltan los positivos [estorvos], que directamente han traido à estorvar, y prohibir el exercicio. Quien no creerà, viendo tan generales aplausos, que he navegado viento en popa, y mar en leche, sobre las palmas de las aclamaciones comunes? Pues Dios sabe, que no ha sido assi: porque entre las flores de essas mismas aclamaciones, se han levantado, y despertado tales aspides de emulaciones, y persecuciones, quantas no podrè contrar; y los que mas nocivos, y sensibles para mi han sido, no son aquellos, que con declarado odio, y malevolencia me han perseguido, sino los que amandome, y deseando mi bien ... me han mortificado, y atormentado mas, que los otros, con aquel: *No conviene a la santa ignorancia, que deben este estudio; se ha de perder, se ha de desvanecer en tanta altura con su mesma perspicacia, y agudeza.* Què me avrà costado resistir esto? Rara especie de martyrio, donde yo era el martyr, y me era el verdugo! ... todo ha sido acercarme mas al fuego de la persecucion, al crisol del tormento: y ha sido con tal extremo, que han llegado a solicitar, que se me prohiba el estudio.

... fuè tan vehemente, y poderosa la inclinacion à las Letras, que ni agenas reprehensiones (que he tenido muchas) ni propias reflexas (que he hecho no pocas) han bastado à que dexe de seguir este natural impulso, que Dios puso en mi: su Magestad sabe ... que le he pedido, que apague la luz de mi entendimiento, dexando solo lo que baste para guardar su Ley, pues lo demàs sobra (segun algunos) en una muger; y aun hay quien diga, que daña.²

We gather from this that she was the object of constant persecution, and to such a degree that she began to ask herself if, after all, she was wrong. Should she give up her literary labors and devote herself to the *camino de perfección*? This was the struggle that was going on in

¹ Both Oviedo and Calleja testify to this. The date can be established by the fact that in February and March, 1694, she signed her *Profesión de la fe* and the *Renovación de los votos religiosos*. To do this she must have served her year as novice. Her *Petición*, undated, says: "... es mi voluntad bolver a tomar el Abito, y passar por el año de aprobacion." This must have been written early in 1693.

² *Fama y obras pòsthumas*, pp. 15, 26-27, 34-35.

her soul and that reached a climax in 1693. It had probably been going on a long time before it came out into the open with the publication of her works. She must have had many enemies. What she suffered we can but guess. Slowly but surely the criticisms of friends and enemies destroyed her peace of mind. Even so, it is doubtful if Sor Juana would ever have given up her books and studies had not events in Mexico so shaped themselves that she felt upon her an inward compulsion.

It now becomes necessary to take a look at what was happening in Mexico between 1691 and 1693. In the summer of 1691 rains and floods were beginning to cause terrible suffering. A contemporary writes:

Lo q.^o se experimento de trabajos en Mexico en estos trece dias no es ponderable. Nadie entrava en la Ciudad por no estar andables los caminos, y las calçadas. Faltò el carbon, la leña, la fruta, las hortalisas, las aves ... El pan no se sasonaba por la mucha agua ... y nada se hallava de quanto hê dicho, sino à exsecivo precio ...

El crecimiento con q.^o se hallava la Laguna de Tescuco à veinte y dos de Julio, dio motivo a los pusilamines para que dixesen à voces *que se anega Mexico*.¹

The crops were ruined and by the end of the year the city was in the grip of a famine. By the beginning of 1692 conditions were so bad that the Viceroy asked that secret prayers be said in convents and monasteries for the relief of the city. Many a day there was no bread. Moreover, the supply of grain in the *alhóndiga* was getting low. The populace began to threaten violence, blaming the Viceroy and his government for their sufferings. Finally, on the night of June 8, 1692, the Indians marched upon the viceregal palace and stormed it, setting fire to it and the surrounding buildings. The Viceroy and his wife took refuge in the monastery of St. Francis. Everybody sought monasteries and other places of security. The soldiers were helpless. Hordes of Indians pillaged the plaza and the surrounding neighborhood. Nothing could be done to stop the terrible riot. Bells rang all night. In the nunneries and monasteries prayers were said. Jesuits and Franciscans went in procession to the plaza in an effort to quiet the rioters, but they were hissed and their images were treated with

¹ Copia de una Carta de don Carlos de Sigüenza y Góngora a don Andrés de Pes acerca de un tumulto acaecido en México (MS), August 30, 1692.

disrespect. After days and nights of terror, during which the churches ceased to function, the civil government succeeded in restoring order. Weeks and months of *azotados* and *ahorcados* kept alive the memory of the tumult. Famine continued to take its toll, for there was no bread. Disease followed. Toward the end of the year the *peste* was general throughout the land. Those were dark days for Mexico. Why had this affliction visited the country? The consensus of opinion was that it was a punishment for the sin, the license and irreligiosity that had reigned in Mexico. Robles says:

Las causas de este estrago se discurren ser nuestras culpas que quiso Dios castigar, tomando por instrumento el mas debil y flaco, como es el de unos miserables indios, desprevenidos, como en otros tiempos lo ha hecho su Divina Magestad, como parece por historias divinas y humanas. ... Dios nos mire con ojos de misericordia! Amen.¹

Sigüenza y Góngora says, speaking of the floods: "Oyese por este tiempo una voz entre las ... del bulgo q^o atribuia à castigo de las pasadas fiestas la tempestad en el monte, el destroso en los Campos, y la inundacion de los arribales"² He says, furthermore: "... yo no dudo q^o mis pecados y los de todos le motivaron [a Dios] à q^o amenazandonos como Padre con azote de agua prosiguiese despues el castigo con hambre p^a nuestra poca enmienda"³ Another contemporary writes: "... hallándonos con un príncipe tan benigno por virey, ... son tantos nuestros pecados, que no ha bastado su santidad y celo para que la justicia de Dios no nos castigue, como lo estamos esperando."⁴

The tragic events just narrated gave point to the remonstrances addressed to Juana on the score of her failure to walk in the *camino de perfección*. Where she had before stopped to reflect occasionally on her duty in the matter, now, with suffering and death on every hand, her own heart, her own conscience, must have taken a hand. It is not unlikely that she blamed herself somewhat for the sad state of affairs in Mexico. Death was everywhere. It took two of her lifelong friends, Juan de Guevara⁵ and Diego de Ribera.⁶ It laid a heavy hand on the

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 97.

² Letter cited.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ "Copia de una carta escrita por un religioso grave ..." *Documentos para la historia de México, segunda serie*, III (Mexico, 1855), 311.

⁵ *Sucesos*, 1676-96 (MS), under date of April 11 and September 7, 1692.

convent of St. Jerome, where ten nuns died¹ between April 24, 1691, and August 5, 1692. And in September, 1692, news came from Spain of the death of her beloved patron, the Count of Paredes. Life was becoming stern. But it was not too late. She could yet make amends. It is something of this spirit that shines through the fanaticism of the last two years of her life. Stern religious counselors had turned her eyes inward upon herself. Could outward compulsion alone have worked such a change? Does it not bespeak inward conviction? Sor Juana had very much a mind of her own. The Inquisition could have made her give up her books, her instruments, her literary labors, but it could not make her *volar a la perfección*. Inner conviction was needed for that.

Does not Juana herself express this in the *Peticion que en forma causidica presenta al Tribunal Divino la Madre Juana Ines de la Cruz, por impetrar perdon de sus culpas*? In it she says:

... en el pleyto que se sigue en el Tribunal de nuestra Justicia contra mis graves, enormes, y sin igual pecados, de los quales me hallo convicta por todos los testigos del Cielo, y de la Tierra, y por lo alegado por parte del Fiscal del crimé de mi propia consciencia, en que halla que debo ser condenada à muerte eterna, y que aun esto será usando conmigo de clemencia, por no bastar infinitos Infernos para mis innumerables crímenes y pecados: ... reconozco no merezco perdon ... con todo, conociendo vuestro infinito amor, è misericordia, y que mientras vivo, estoy en tiempo, y que no me han cerrado los terminos del poder apelar de la sentencia ... con todo, por quanto sabeis vos que ha tantos años que yo vivo en Religion, no solo sin Religion, sino peor que pudiera un Pagano: ... es mi voluntad bolver à tomar el Abito, y passar por el año de aprobacion. ...²

Undoubtedly force of circumstances joining hands with many parallel influences had brought about a crisis in Juana's life; not one cause, but many, working toward a common end, gradually broke the strong spirit and made her accept the martyr's rôle.

How did Juana carry out her penitence, for such it was? Oviedo says, speaking of this and of Father Núñez' part in it:

Quedose la Madre Juana sola con su Esposo, y ... el amor le daba alientos à su imitacion, procurando con empeño crucificar sus pasiones, y apetitos con tan ferrenoso rigor en la penitencia, que necesitaba del prudente cuidado, y

¹ *Libro de Profhessiones.*

² *Fama y obras posthumas*, pp. 129-31.

atencion del Padre Antonio para irle á la mano, porque no acabasse á manos de su fervor la vida. Y solia decir el Padre alabando á Dios, que Juana Ines no corria sino que volaba á la perfeccion.¹

Everything she had she sold for the relief of the poor. The same writer says:

... se deshizo de la copiosa libreria que tenia, sin reservar para su uso sino unos pocos libritos espirituales que le ayudassen en sus santos intentos. Echó tambien de la celda todos los instrumentos musicos, y mathematicos singulares, y exquisitos que tenia, y quantas alhajas de valor, y estima la avia tributado la admiracion, y aplauso de los que celebraban sus prendas como prodigios; y reducido todo á reales, fuerõ bastantes á ser alivio, y socorro de muchissimos Pobres.²

This, too, confirms the theory that the suffering in Mexico had much to do with her renunciation. She was joined in her charitable enterprise by Aguiar y Seixas, who also sold his library for the relief of the poor.

Two years later her penitence reached the heights of the heroic when, during the plague that invaded the convent of St. Jerome, Juana labored night and day nursing the sick, comforting the dying, and laying out the dead. Her fragile spirit, broken by the storms that had beaten about her, gave up the unequal struggle, and she who once had been the object of hatred and jealousy died in the odor of sanctity, revered and loved by all.

DOROTHY SCHONS

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 137.

² *Loc. cit.*

A NOTE ON THE ITALIAN GENEALOGY OF
DU BELLAY'S *OLIVE*, SONNET CXIII

Sonnet CCCLV of Petrarch's *Canzoniere*¹ runs as follows:

O tempo, o ciel volubil che fuggendo
Inganni i ciechi e miseri mortali,
O di veloci più che venti o strali,
Or ab esperto vostre frodi intendo.
Ma scuso voi e me stesso riprendo:
Ché Natura a volar v'aperse l'ali,
A me died'occhi; et io pur ne' miei mali
Li tenni, onde vergogna e dolor prendo.
E sarebbe ora, et é passata omai,
Di rivoltarli in più sicura parte
E poner fine a l'infiniti guai.
Né dal tuo giogo, Amor, l'alma si parte
Ma del suo mal; con che studio, tu 'l sai;
Non a caso è vertute, anzi è bell'arte.

The poet is reorienting himself in his universe after Laura's death, and realizing how the swift years have carried him on in an earthly rather than in a spiritual attachment to her. His reproach to the years is however slighter than his self-reproach, in so far as time must by its very nature fly onward, while Petrarch has misused the vision which nature granted him, and has kept it directed toward an unworthy object in the physical charm of Laura. Now in his later life he suffers from the thought of this error, and is further humiliated to feel that it is only Laura's death which is making him turn his thought to her celestial qualities—his new virtue is compulsory at best.

The sonnet has its interest as a document in what is sometimes miscalled Petrarch's Platonism of thought; but it also stands as a starting-point for a train of ideas which pass down into French poetry through Sannazaro, Bernardino Daniello, and Joachim du Bellay. It is this train of ideas, with their varying expression, which I wish to study here.

¹ *Le Rime di Francesco Petrarca ... commentate da Giosuè Carducci e Severino Ferrari* (Firenze: Sansoni, 1915), p. 490.

[MODERN PHILOLOGY, November, 1926]

In the eighth *versus* of the *Arcadia*,¹ beginning with the words of Eugenio, "Ove si sol," there appear the following lines, in which Eugenio is exhorting Clonico not to give himself up to despair in his unhappy love:

Questa vita mortale al dì somigliasi:
 Il qual, poy che se vede giunto al termine
 Pien di scorno al'ocaso renvermigliasi,
 Cossi quando veghiezza advien che termine
 Y mal spesi anni, che si racti volano,
 Vergogna & duol convien che al cor si germine.
 Ad che le menti cieche se consolano,
 Si nostri affanni un fumo alfin diventano,
 E l'hore ladre y nostri beni involano?
 Dunque è ben tempo omay che si risentano
 I spirti tuoy sepulti anzi le esequie
 Nel fango; onde convien ch'al fin si pentano.

The correspondence between these verses and those of Petrarch above is at once evident. Eugenio is making the same appeal to Clonico that Petrarch is making to himself, pointing out that time passes rapidly and that it becomes increasingly urgent to turn from an unworthy love to a loftier contemplation. The sentiment itself is not such an unusual one that one need call Petrarch the source of Sannazaro's verse in this passage, were it not for the verbal echoes which appear. Petrarch apostrophizes time, which "Inganni i ciechi e miseri mortali"; his successor uses the metaphor of the "hore ladre" which "i nostri beni involano," and speaks of the "menti cieche" which live in a fools' paradise. Where Petrarch addresses the lightning-swift days of man's life, Sannazaro shifts his attention to the years which "si racti volano." Petrarch in his seventh and eight lines feels "vergogna e dolor" at the thought of his misused power of insight; Sannazaro condemns the "mal spesi anni" whose passage arouses in him "vergogna e duol." For Petrarch the hour is now come or even "passata omai" for him to turn his eyes to more permanent things; for Sannazaro's Eugenio "è ben tempo omay che si risentano I spirti tuoi." As it is Petrarch's "alma" which is now turning to a celestial

¹ *Arcadie di Jacopo Sannazaro ... con note ed introduzione di Michele Scherillo* (Turin: Loescher, 1888), p. 157. Scherillo gives several references to Petrarch for scattered expressions in this *versus*, but fails to indicate the above-cited sonnet as the most important source.

object, so "spirti" conveys the idea for the later poet. Petrarch feels keenly the need of "poner fine a l'infiniti guai," while Sannazaro expresses the same thought in similar terms: "convien ch' al fin si pentano."

The close parallelism of thought and phrase in these two passages is neatly supplemented by the juxtaposition with them of that well-known sonnet of Bernardino Daniello, found in the *Rime Diverse*¹—that collection of which Joachim du Bellay made such good use for the *Olive*. The sonnet runs:

Se 'l viver nostro è breve oscuro giorno
 Press'a l'eterno, e pien d'affanni e mali;
 Et piu veloci assai che venti, o strali
 Ne vedi ir gli anni, e piu non far ritorno
 Alma; che fai? che non ti miri intorno
 Sepolta in cieco error tra le mortali
 Noiose cure? e poi ti son date ali
 Da volar a l'eterno alto soggiorno,
 Scuoti le trista ch'è ben tempo homai
 Fuor del visco mondan ch'è sì tenace,
 E le dispiega al ciel per dritta via;
 Ivi è quel sommo ben ch'ogni huom desia;
 Ivi 'l vero riposo; ivi la pace
 Ch'indarno tu quagiu cercando vai.

In this sonnet the underlying idea is the same as that of the two earlier passages, even though the occasion for it is no longer expressed as a personal thing like an unhappy love-affair. Here again, as above, the evident similarity of thought is not so great (especially in a period when such matters exercised the soul and versifying power of every lyric poet) as to prove offhand that Daniello was copying Petrarch or Sannazaro or both. But, also as above, a glance at the parallels in phraseology makes the relationship certain beyond peradventure.

Daniello has kept the metaphor of man's life as a rapidly passing day; here he is borrowing from the *Arcadia* and not from the *Canzoniere*, in which appears merely the notion of the speed with which life passes. Two lines later, however, he finds to his hand terms used by both Petrarch and Sannazaro to express that speed. Petrarch has addressed the days of man's life as "veloci più che venti e strali";

¹ Lodovico Domenichi, *Rime Diverse di Molti eccellentissimi autori nuovamente raccolte* (Venice: Giolito, 1546), Book I.

Sannazaro has said of the years that they "racti volano"; but Daniello echoes Petrarch exactly in his "piu veloci assai che venti, o strali." Next, Daniello qualifies this life as "pien d'affanni e mali"; the second noun he has found in the seventh line of Petrarch's sonnet, while "affanni" comes straight from the eighth line of the excerpt cited from the *Arcadia*. Then comes the appeal to the soul, "Alma; che fai?" which Du Bellay uses with such effect in the one hundred and thirteenth sonnet of the *Olive*. Petrarch used it first, in his eleventh line, and *mutatis mutandis* in the same sense; the equivalent "spirti" takes its place in Sannazaro's penultimate line. Now Daniello picks up another metaphor from the Neapolitan poet which is not in their common original: the widespread medieval picture of the soul caught in the filth of earthly desire. Sannazaro represents the "spirti ... sepulti ... nel fango"; Daniello, using now the image of the winged soul (from Plato's *Phaedrus* possibly), bids the soul take flight "fuor del visco mondan ch'è si tenace." He moreover emphasizes the need for instant action in the words "ch'è ben tempo homai," as Sannazaro has said, "è ben tempo omai," and Petrarch, "E sarebbe hora, et è passata omai." Describing the present state of the soul, Daniello speaks of it as buried "in cieco error tra le mortali ... cure"; Sannazaro's corresponding expression is "le menti cieche" of mankind, while Petrarch has used the term in his "ciechi e miseri mortali."

Thus it is evident both that Petrarch's ideas and words have passed directly to Daniello's verse, and that Daniello laid Sannazaro under contribution as well for the more picturesque of his figures.¹

The debt acknowledged by all students of Joachim du Bellay to Joseph Vianey² needs no recapitulating; but to complete the chain whose other links are the above-studied passages from Petrarch, Sannazaro, and Daniello, the scholar is urged to examine Du Bellay's famous Sonnet CXIII of the *Olive*, whose provenance may be made somewhat clearer by the consideration of its several Italian forebears.

ROBERT VALENTINE MERRILL

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

¹ Incidentally, it is worth while noting that Daniello has caught very closely the music of Petrarch's lines by the simple device of using five rhyme-words found in the earlier sonnet.

² "Les Sources italiennes de l' *Olive*," *Annales nationales d'histoire* (vie sec.; Paris, 1900), pp. 71 ff.

GLOSSES ON DU BELLAY

I

HEUREUX QUI COMME ULYSSE ...

It is well known that Catullus "aux vers sucrés"¹ was one of Du Bellay's favorite authors during his stay at Rome, but it has not yet been pointed out that the famous thirty-first sonnet of the *Regrets* bears distinct traces of his preference for the Lover of Lesbia.

Is it a mere coincidence that Catullus, too, in his thirty-first elegy sings of his happiness at his return to the "gem of isles and peninsulas," his native Sirmio?

Quam te libenter quamque laetus in viso.

He hardly believes himself to be really again at home:

Vix mi ipse credens Thyniam atque Bithynos
Liquisse campos et videre te in tuto.

Du Bellay did not merely translate the poem; his nostalgia is a variation on the theme familiar enough to the migrating humanists.² He impressed the theme with a truly modern sensitiveness, and yet the sentiments, nay even the words, of Du Bellay's sonnet very closely resemble those of Catullus in the following four lines by which the latter exults at his own coming home. At the hearth of his ancestors he will repose from the fatigues of his wanderings:

O quid solutis est beatius curis,
Cum mens onus reponit, ac peregrino
Labore fessi venimus ad larem nostrum
Desideratoque aquiescimus lecto.

Also the immortal *Loire gaulois* has its model in the poem of Catullus, the *labuae lacus undae* which the Latin poet greets with rapture.

¹ "Hymne de Santé," *Poésies françaises et latines de J. Du Bellay*, ed., Courbet, II (Paris: Garnier Frères, 1918), 88. On Catullus in the Renaissance cf. J. Burckhardt, *Die Cultur der Renaissance in Italien*; E. A. Seemann, I (Leipzig, 1898), 295; and A. Sainati, *La lirica latina del Rinascimento*, I (Pisa: Spoerri, 1919), 4 ff.

² Marullus envied the breezes which were permitted to visit the shores of Bosphorus (*Nenias*, Impressum Fani in aedibus Hieronymi Goncini, 1515); Sannazaro sighed for Naples in France (cf. Sainati, *op. cit.*, p. 192).

The longing for the faraway home necessarily changed the tone of Du Bellay, the distance from France to Rome made his emotion less eruptive than that of Catullus, and the craving for his *petit Lyré* could not break forth with the overwhelming effusion of his master:

Ridete quidquid est domi cachinnorum.

Horatian philosophy¹ moderated Du Bellay's praise of his modest little home, but when preferring his house to "des palais romains le front audacieux," he used a reminiscence of *Aeneid* iv. 88-89:

. . . minaeque
murorum ingentes . . .

which he had translated with "Et des palais le front audacieux" in his version of the *Aeneid*.²

"Le marbre dur," likewise, occurred in the same translation of Du Bellay.³ It is the rendering of Virgil's "solido de marmore."⁴

Thus, besides the inspiration of Du Bellay, Homer, Horace, Ovid, Virgil, and chiefly Catullus were at work in creating the "King of the French Sonnets."

II

DU BELLAY'S CONCEPTION OF THE IDEAL POET

The ninth ode of Du Bellay's *Recueil de Poésie* (1549) is little more than a mosaic of well-known Horatian ideas. *Les Conditions du vray Poëte* is a brief synopsis of all that Horace said of himself. It is the merging of four passages of Horace, two of which are recorded by Chamard's authoritative edition of Du Bellay.⁵ Chamard does not mention the first ode of the first book of the *Carmina*, and the first poem of the second book of the *Epistolae*,⁶ in which Horace portrayed his model poet.

But the combination of all the four passages had already been done before Du Bellay, and presumably not without his knowledge.

A little collection of Latin poems by Girolamo Angeriano, published in 1520⁷ in Naples, must have been known to the French humanists of the sixteenth century, as it was republished in Paris in

¹ On the relationship of Du Bellay and Horace, cf. E. Stemplinger, *Herrigs Archiv*, CXII, 80 ff.

² *Ed. cit.*, I, 282.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 338.

⁴ *Aeneid* vi. 69.

⁵ *Œuvres poétiques*, III (1912), 120.

⁶ *Epistolae* II. 1. 118-31.

⁷ The first edition, listed by Brunet, does not contain *De vero Poeta*.

1542, not long before the date of publication of Du Bellay's ode.¹ A lengthy poem in distichs, entitled *De vero Poeta*, is added to Angeriano's *Erotopaegnion* which like Du Bellay's ode attributes universal value to the emotions of Horace and bases the ideal of the poet on Horatian philosophy and inspiration. Angeriano, like the early theorists of the Italian Renaissance,² emphasizes the *vates*-like qualities of the poet, who loves leisurely solitude, avoids the mob, seeks refuge in forests, meadows, and caves, and on flowery shores of rivers, who despises riches and the favor of the court, and

Effugit a turba immiti, dulcesque recessus
Poscit, et Aonios excitat ore sonos.

Du Bellay's poet acts in the same manner:

Il fuit volontiers la vile,
Il hait en toute saison,
La faulx tourbe civile,
Ennemie de raison.

The following passage of Angeriano's poem

Fontanas non spernit aquas, scopulosa nec antra,
Nec fugit undisona littora grata maris ...

seems to be the original of Du Bellay's

Il tarde le cours des ondes,
Il donne oreilles aux bois,
Et les cavernes profondes
Fait rechanter sous sa voix.

These agreements, however, might be explained by the fact that both poets imitated Horace, Du Bellay more closely than the Italian humanist. But, at any rate, it is likely that the French poet borrowed the idea of combining scattered Horatian thoughts in one poem from the Italian, as it is indicated by the similarity of the titles of both poems.

¹ Cf. on Angeriano, F. Lo Parco, *Un accademico pontaniano del secolo XVI precursore dell' Ariosto e del Parini* (Arlano, 1898), reviewed by F. Flaminio in *Rassegna bibl. della lett. it.*, VI, 289 ff.; and Ginguéné's article in Michaud's *Biographie Universelle*. Scarce notes on his life and works are found in Mazzuchelli, *Scrittori d'Italia*, II (Brescia, 1753), 772-73; in Toppi, *Biblioteca Napoletana*, p. 155; Nicodemo, *Addizioni alla Biblioteca di Toppi*, p. 134. Morhof, *Polyhist. Lit.* I, Lib. VII, Cap. III, num. 4, and Tiraboschi, *Storia della Lett. it.*, VII (Firenze: Molini, Landi e Cia, 1812), 1367, merely mention him. Grasse, *Lehrbuch einer allg. Literaturgeschichte*, Vol. III (Leipzig, 1852), Part I, p. 508, records a sixteenth-century French novel dealing with Angeriano.

² Cf. Karl Vossler, *Poetische Theorien in der italienischen Frührenaissance*. Berlin: E. Felber, 1900.

The *Recueil de Poésie* was published in the same year as the *Deffence*,¹ in which Du Bellay gave for the first time vigorous and enthusiastic expression to the ideals which the true poet, in his opinion, had to strive for.

The first lines of Angeriano's *De vero Poeta*,

Ocia amat vates et tecto et umbra

Plectra movet, grati perquirat flabra favoni,

In viridi flores carpere gestit humo,

seem to be paraphrased in the following passage of the *Deffence*: "Les uns [i.e., poets] ayment les fresches umbres des forestz, les clers ruisseaux doucement murmurans parmi les prez ornez et tapissez de verdure."²

The Renaissance ideal of the *doctus poeta* appears in the passage of the *Deffence* in which Du Bellay demands that the poet be "instruit de tous bons arts et sciences, principalement mathematiques."³

Angeriano's poet is a superman, who in an almost divine omniscience does not share the superstitions of the populace. "Impavidus stat semper . . .," like another Hercules.⁴ He knows mathematics and astronomy:

Scit Phoebum, et Phoebi candentia signa sororis,

Scit coeli motus.⁵

He knows history:

Scit bene mutari vario sub tempore leges

Et fieri a pravis regibus usque truces.

He is conversant with medicine:

Scit morbi causas, sinuosi et corporis atros

Secessus, medicae deserit artis opus.

Like Du Bellay's poet who does not shun the realities of life, because he must not be "ignorant des parties et offices de la vie humaine," Angeriano's model poet "In fora conductus leges observat."

¹ H. Chamard, ed. *critique*. Paris: A. Fontemoling, 1904.

² *Op. cit.*, Book II, chap. v, pp. 233-34.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 233.

⁴ Similar ideas are expressed by a contemporary of Angeriano, Antonio Mancinelli; cf. Vossler, *op. cit.*, p. 66.

⁵ Cf. the astronomical poems by Pontano, Palingenius, and Buchanan.

Du Bellay's poet sings "non troublé d'affaires domestiques, mais en repos et tranquillité d'esprit"; Angeriano's, from his ivory tower, looks on the tribulations of life with supreme equanimity:

Sors quaecunque dedit fert aequo pectore, verus
Protheus in cunctis rebus adesse solet.
In praesens hilaris non differt gaudia, mente
Ille hilaris pulsa nube serena colit.

P. Villey, without having positive proofs, suspected that the poetics of the *Deffence*, like the apology of the French language, was copied from some Italian author.¹ Literal agreements could not be proved between Angeriano and Du Bellay, but the general trend of Du Bellay's ideas, his picture of the ideal poet, very closely resemble the portrait painted by the Italian humanist. Both followed Horace, but Angeriano undoubtedly preceded Du Bellay. Du Bellay must have known him, and thus we may suppose that Angeriano was the direct model whom Du Bellay imitated both in his *Conditions du vray Poëte* and the quoted passages of the *Deffence*.

ARPAD STEINER

MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY

¹ P. Villey, *Les Sources italiennes de la Deffence de Du Bellay* (Paris: Champion, 1908), p. 79.



THE BLACKFRIARS MYSTERY

On January 29, 1661, that pertinacious patron of the drama, Mr. Samuel Pepys, asserts that he "went to Blackfryers (the first time I was ever there since plays begun), and there . . . I saw three acts of *The Mayd in ye Mill* acted to my great content." Since this play of Fletcher's was among those allocated to Sir William D'Avenant when he and Tom Killigrew, sharers in the theatrical monopoly, cavalierly divided the existing stock of "old plays," we can be fairly certain that the performance was by the company which five months later was to open the new house in Lincoln's Inn Fields and impose on the English theater, for better or worse, the picture stage of the Italian opera.

This particular entry of the usually accurate diarist has been the occasion of misleading notes by several historians of the stage, though by most of the fraternity it has been ignored. It raises the interesting question, "Was there, during the season of 1660-61, another London theater than those commonly recognized, and did D'Avenant's company play there?" I think I have guessed the answer, and venture to hope it may find favor despite my inability conclusively to prove its correctness. But before considering it we must review the pertinent facts.

Although D'Avenant's patent for a theatrical company was issued on August 21, 1660, it was not till November 5 that Betterton and his other players signed on as parties to the new venture. Among the articles of the agreement, which is designed principally to regulate the finances of the projected theater in Lincoln's Inn Fields, were the following specifications:

¹ Professor Allardyce Nicoll believes there was a definite principle controlling this division, though in his comment on my note concerning "The Restoration Play Lists" (*Review of English Studies*, I [October, 1925], 446) he does not respond to my solicitation of the evidence which establishes a close "connection between Beeston's boys of 1640 and the Duke's players of 1662." No one knows better than those who have trodden the maze of London stage history for the months directly after the reopening of the theaters that the possibility of egregious error must restrain dogmatism, yet I confess I still see little necessity for an elaborate theory at this point, much less for one which relies on hypothetical sources for the Restoration quartos after the real sources have been established. The plays had to be divided. Killigrew specialized in the popular Jacobean, Jonson and Fletcher; D'Avenant went in for opera and for Shakespeare the Elizabethan, whose more archaic scenes called, he thought, for operatic embellishment. (The actual allotment of plays as found in the lord chamberlain's records is somewhat misleading.)

1. That D'Avenant erects the actors named into a company to play in any theatre "untill the said Sir William Davenant shall provide a newe Theatre with scenes."

2. That the company is authorized by D'Avenant to act "Tragedies, Comedies, and playes in the Playhouse called Salisbury Court Playhouse, or any other house."

3. That on one week's notice the Company is to cease playing and move to the new house "and Joyne with the said Henry Harris,¹ and with other men and women prouided or to be prouided by the said Sir. Wm. Davenant, to performe such Tragedies, Comedies, Playes, and representacions in that Theatre to be publicquely prouided by him the said Sir William as aforesaid."

On the same day that saw these articles signed, Killigrew's troupe, the "Old Actors," withdrew from the Cockpit in Drury Lane² to their old haunts at the Red Bull. We have several lists of plays drawn up by Sir Henry Herbert in furtherance of his claims for adjusted compensation; one of these contains the following marginal note: "Nouember '60. This is a List of plays acted by the Kings Companie at the Red Bull and the new house in Gibbon's Tennis Court near Clare Market."³ The list begins:

Monday the 5. Nouember. '60.	Wit without Money.
Tuesday the 6. No.	The Traitor
Wensday the 7. No.	The Beggars Bush
Thursday the 8. No.	Henry the fourthe.
	First Play Acted at the new Theatre.

The King's company, then, acted for three days at the Red Bull, probably because the Vere Street house was not ready for them. *Henry the Fourth* was apparently the third Restoration revival of Shakespeare;⁴ it is noteworthy that a Shakespearean play was selected to open the new theater. This was a much smaller house than the Red Bull, being a remodeled tennis court in Vere Street, Clare Market.⁵ Here His Majesty's Servants acted till 1663, when the first

¹ The scene-painter and actor, Popys's friend.

² It will be noticed that despite Professor Nicoll's doubts (*Restoration Drama*, p. 274) I adhere to the theory of Robert W. Lowe (*Thomas Betterton*, p. 68) that there was for a time a united company at the Cockpit in Drury Lane. My reasons must be reserved for a fuller treatment of the London companies during these months, which I have included in a brief history of the Restoration stage shortly forthcoming.

³ J. Q. Adams, *Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert*, pp. 116-18; Malone (1803), III, 329-32, (Var.) III, 273; Halliwell-Phillips, *Collection of Ancient Documents Respecting the Office of the Master of the Revels*, etc., pp. 34 ff. The man's name was actually Gibbons.

⁴ The first seems to have been *Pericles* and the second *Othello*.

⁵ "Clare Market, Lincoln's Inn Fields, between Lincoln's Inn Fields and the Strand." Cunningham-Wheatley, *London Past and Present*, I, 407; see also the more authoritative notes of Haslewood in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, LXXXIII (II, Oct., 1813), 333.

Theater Royal in Drury Lane was built by them. It was not till they occupied the latter house that they made use of scenes. The authority for this statement is the *Historia Histrionica* of Joseph Wright (1699), which makes it categorically:

LOVEWIT. Yes, presently after the Restauration, the King's Players Acted publickly at the Red Bull for some time, and then Removed to a New-built Play-house in Vere-Street, by Claremarket. There they continued for a Year or two, and then removed to the Theater Royal in Drury-lane, where they first made use of Scenes.¹

Mr. Lawrence confirms this statement emphatically, but remarks that he anticipates being asked "a somewhat ugly question"—why did Killigrew remove and fit up this new theater (pronounced by Pepys on November 20, 1660 "the finest playhouse, I believe, that ever was in England") if not to secure the advantages of scenery? Mr. Lawrence's answer, which he considers inadequate, is the greater accessibility of Vere Street.² But the other disadvantages of the Red Bull, its being an old house, partly open to the weather, and very large, are reasons enough for the removal. When the Old Actors united with Rhodes's company in the fall of 1660, they elected to play at the Cockpit in Drury Lane and not at the Red Bull. Mr. Lawrence may have discounted this fact, which depends of course on acceptance of Lowe's theory of a united company. At any rate, in describing Killigrew's removal to Vere Street, he states that the King's players had been acting at the Red Bull for at least three or four months.³ If I do not mistake, they had been there but three days—November 5, 6, and 7—and moved on the eighth. I believe they returned to the Red Bull because Vere Street was not quite ready for them, and never intended that their stay there should be more than temporary.

About a week after the King's company, under Killigrew, had opened at Vere Street, the other company, soon to be known as the Duke's, under D'Avenant, began acting at the Salisbury Court house. The date usually given for their first performance there is November 15, 1660, but I have never seen authority for it. The date appears to rest on a statement of Malone, which he probably based on a reference in Sir Henry Herbert's declaration in his action against Betterton,

¹ Joseph Wright, *Historia Histrionica*, repr. Lowe's ed. Cibber's *Apology*, I, xxxii.

² The Red Bull was in St. John's Street, Clerkenwell (Cunningham-Wheatley, III, 153 ff.). For its previous history see J. Q. Adams, *Shakespearean Playhouses*, pp. 294-309.

³ W. J. Lawrence, *Elizabethan Playhouse, Second Series*, p. 139. It is of course well known that they had been at the Red Bull during the previous summer.

May 6, 1662.¹ Herbert charges the defendant with acting without their having been licensed "10 new Playes and 100 revived Playes" from November 15, 1660, to date. This seems to imply that the new company began to perform at Salisbury Court on November 15. Their agreement with D'Avenant, already cited, clearly indicates that this season was intended merely to occupy the interim till the new house in Lincoln's Inn Fields should be ready. D'Avenant was wrapped up in his scenic obsessions and probably paid little attention to his troupe, aside from accepting his daily share of the profits.

A more ticklish question is whether this company remained at Salisbury Court until they began rehearsals for the new theater in Lincoln's Inn Fields. In Herbert's reply (July 11, 1662) to D'Avenant's petition for relief from his interference, the indignant Master of the Revels presents an itemized statement of the fees he considers due. Among these he demands the customary rakeoff, or as he terms it "allowance,"² "for new and old playes acted by Sir William Dauenantes pretended company of players at Salisbury Court, the Cockpitt, and now at Portus³ Rowe in Lincoln's Inn Fields, from the 5th Novemb. 60. the tyme of their first conjunction with Sir William Daenant."³

There are three possibilities, if Herbert is correct in his statement that this company acted at the Cockpit after November 5, 1660. The first is that after the agreement made on that date they remained in Drury Lane and gave performances there, presumably because Salisbury Court was not ready for them. This would account for the sudden return of the King's men to the Red Bull and their inconvenient season of three days there. But against this hypothesis is Herbert's selection (in his declaration against Betterton) of November 15 as the date of D'Avenant's commencing operations.⁴ A second possibility is that the company came back to the Cockpit in Drury

¹ Malone (1803), III, 316. In December, 1661, Herbert had won a similar case against Mohun and several other members of the King's company. This verdict is referred to in a treaty of amity between Killigrew and Herbert, drawn up June 4, 1662 (Adams, pp. 113-15), and in a subsequent agreement by Killigrew to pay the costs of Herbert's suit against his own actors (*ibid.*, pp. 115-16).

² Cf. Herbert's use of the word in the first item of his list: "Allowance for charges of suites at law." It is clear that "allowance," as he uses it in this document, does not refer to the licensing power but to the fee.

³ The whole document is reprinted as follows: Adams, pp. 120-23; Malone (1803), III, 320-24, (Var.) III, 266 ff.

⁴ Adams, pp. 108-10; Halliwell-Phillips, pp. 39 ff.

Lane for at least one special performance after they had set up in Salisbury Court; and the third is that Herbert is referring to special performances in the royal Cockpit at Whitehall. That he intended to collect fees for such performances is clear enough from the last item in his schedule of "allowances," already cited: "That rehearsall of plays to be acted at court, be made, as hath been accustomed, before the Master of the Reuells, or allowance for them."

Of these three possibilities the last seems to me on the whole the most likely. If Herbert were referring to performances at the Cockpit in Drury Lane before the opening at Salisbury Court, the natural order of listing the theaters would give first place to the Cockpit. Furthermore, the silence of Pepys would be hard to account for if D'Avenant's company had given a season there. Pepys was a regular patron of theirs and a great admirer of Betterton; he records during this period frequent visits to Salisbury Court but none to the Cockpit in Drury Lane. Finally, the sudden removal of the King's company to the Red Bull might have been occasioned by the ousting of Beeston from Salisbury Court and his occupation of the Cockpit in Drury Lane, where we know his troupe was acting a little later in the season.

Probably, then, Herbert's reference to the Cockpit is to the theater in the palace.¹ The fact is that from November 5, 1660, when D'Avenant organized his company, till late in June, 1661, when he opened his theater in Lincoln's Inn Fields, we know almost nothing about its operations except from Pepys; and several investigators have been completely mystified, while others have calmly ignored the existence of dubious problems. The silence of Downes is maddening; he quite passes over this interim except to indicate the location of rehearsals for the new house. This reference has more than once been mistakenly identified with that of Pepys to the mysterious Blackfriars theater.

Downes records a solitary aberration from Salisbury Court, as follows:

His Company being now Compleat, Sir William in order to prepare Plays to Open his Theatre, it being then a Building in Lincoln's Inn Fields, His Company Rehears'd the First and Second Part of the Siege of Rhodes; and

¹ Malone is vague on this point. He says: "On the 15th of Nov. 1660, Sir William D'Avenant's company began to act under these articles at the theatre in Salisbury-court, at which house or at the Cockpit they continued to play till March or April 1662" (Malone [1803], III, 315 ff.). The opening of the new theater was actually in June, 1661. On p. 332 Malone says that D'Avenant's company, "after having played for some time at the Cockpit in Drury Lane, and at Salisbury Court, removed"

the Wits at Pothecaries Hall: And in Spring 1662 Open'd his House with the said Plays, having new Scenes and Decorations, being the first that e're were Introduc'd in England.¹

The reader should note in the first place that Downes says nothing about *performances* at Apothecaries' Hall, only *rehearsals*.²

On Pepys's account of his visit to "Blackfryers" Miss McAfee makes this note: "Probably . . . a theatre in what was known as Cobham House, which stood in Water Lane, Blackfriars, on the site of Apothecaries' Hall before the Great Fire."³ She follows Wheatley: "At Apothecaries' Hall, where Davenant produced the first and second parts of 'The Siege of Rhodes.' Downes says in his 'Roscius Anglicanus' that Davenant's company acted at 'Pothecaries Hall' until the building in Lincoln's Inn Fields was ready."⁴ This note is extremely inaccurate. As we have seen, Downes says explicitly that "in order to prepare Plays to Open his Theatre" D'Avenant's company "*Rehears'd* the First and Second Parts of the Siege of Rhodes; and the Wits at Pothecaries Hall; and [later] . . . Open'd his House [i.e., in Lincoln's Inn Fields] with the said Plays."

As for identification of Pepys's "Blackfryers" with Downes's "Pothecaries Hall," Wheatley offers no reason for making it, while Miss McAfee says merely that Cobham House stood in Water Lane, Blackfriars. But what does Pepys himself say? "Went to Blackfryers (*the first time I was ever there since plays begun*)."

Obviously, then, Pepys is referring to a *regular theater*. Let us now compare his statement with the others in which he records first visits to playhouses.

1. Pepys's first visit to the Cockpit in Drury Lane, August 18, 1660: "To the Cockpitt play, the first that I have had time to see since my coming from sea."

¹ John Downes, *Roscius Anglicanus* (ed. Knight), p. 20.

² Joseph Knight (Preface to his edition of Downes's *Roscius Anglicanus*, pp. xiv ff.) follows Cunningham-Wheatley, I, 55) in stating that Apothecaries' Hall was not built till 1670, and in assuming the existence of an earlier structure. I am indebted to Professor Kittredge for references to C. R. B. Barrett, *The History of the Society of Apothecaries* (1905), pp. 42-43, 77, 79 ff., whence I learn that the building in question was purchased by the society in 1632 from Lady Ann Howard, of Effingham, for a hall, which lasted till it was partially or wholly destroyed by the Fire of 1666. There was, therefore, an Apothecaries' Hall at the time referred to.

³ Helen McAfee, *Pepys on the Restoration Stage*, p. 289, n. 1.

⁴ *Pepys's Diary* (ed. 1893-96), I, 312, n. 2. Mr. Allardyce Nicoll ends his discussion of the "wandering troupes" of the Restoration by noting that Pepys mentions a performance at the Blackfriars (*Restoration Drama*, p. 279), but later he omits it from the list of "theatres already mentioned" (p. 280).

2. Pepys's first visit to the Duke's house in Lincoln's Inn Fields, July 2, 1661: "To Sir William Davenant's Opera; this being the fourth day that it hath begun, and the first that I have seen it."

3. Pepys's first visit to the King's house, Vere Street, Clare Market, November 20, 1660: "to the new Play-house near Lincoln's Inn Fields (which was formerly Gibbons' tennis court) . . . and indeed it is the finest play-house, I believe, that ever was in England."

4. Pepys's first visit to Killigrew's first Drury Lane theater. He refers September 24, 1662, and February 6, 1663, to its building. May 7, 1663, he writes: "This day the new Theatre Royal begins to act with scenes the Humorous Lieutenant, but I have not time to see it." His first visit was on the next day: "To the Theatre Royall, being the second day of its being opened." He goes into some detail in criticizing the construction of the new house.

5. Pepys's first visit to the Red Bull, March 23, 1661: "Then out to the Red Bull (where I had not been since plays come up again)."

The reader must have been struck by the particularity with which Pepys mentions, in every one of these cases, either that it is his first visit, or that the house is new. I have purposely omitted, for the present, the account of his first visit to the Salisbury Court theater; but I have listed every other. From the similarity of their phraseology, and the likeness of the "Blackfryers" reference to them, it seems reasonably clear that Pepys is there, too, referring to his first visit to a public playhouse. This could not have been the famous old Blackfriars theater, for that had been pulled down on August 5, 1655.¹

As Pepys's first visit to D'Avenant's company at Salisbury Court, Miss McAfee gives² (though not in full) the entry for February 9, 1661: "To Whitefriars to the Play-house and saw 'The Mad Lover,' the first time I ever saw it acted, which I like pretty well." Why Pepys mentions Whitefriars she explains with entire clearness:

The term "Whitefriars" is used to designate the quarter so-called (between Fleet Street and the Thames, east of the Temple), in which stood the Salisbury Court theatre, rebuilt in 1660, and not to designate the old Whitefriars theatre of the pre-Restoration period. It will be noted from a comparison of the entries for March 19 and March 26 [1661] that Pepys used the term "Whitefriars" and "Salisbury Court" interchangeably.³

¹ "Notes on London Buildings and Churches, A.D. 1631-1658," *Harrison's England*, Vol. II (New Shaks. Soc.), cited by Cunningham-Wheatley, I, 201.

² McAfee, p. 302.

³ This use of *Whitefriars* to refer to the Salisbury Court theater is in fact not uncommon. Cf. H. Moseley's letter of August 30, 1660, to Sir Henry Herbert (Adams, p. 90).

Now if this were Pepys's first visit to the Salisbury Court theater it would be his only entry of a first visit to a public playhouse in which he failed either to mention that fact or to describe the house as new. This discrepancy neatly coincides with our inability to explain Pepys's visit to a Blackfriars theater. What more likely than that "Blackfriars" is a slip, on the part of the transcriber, the editors, or Pepys himself, for "Whitefriars," and that the entry of January 29, 1661, records his first visit to Salisbury Court?

Such a mistake would not be unnatural even for Pepys. Though the old theater was no more, members of the old company were still active, and its tradition was the accepted standard in matters theatrical.¹ Moreover, it was to see D'Avenant's actors that Pepys went chiefly at this time; and presumably they were at Salisbury Court on this date. As we have seen, the reference is clearly not to Apothecaries' Hall, but to a regular theater. Why should the Duke's company have left Salisbury Court except for performances before the King at Whitehall, or to rehearse for the new theater in Lincoln's Inn Fields? That they played regularly at Salisbury Court during the later winter and spring is shown by Pepys's own record; for he went there repeatedly to see plays that were on D'Avenant's reserved list. He saw Massinger's *The Bondman* three times during this period (i.e., November, 1660—June, 1661), and notes that "above all that ever I saw, Betterton do the Bondman best." He saw Fletcher performed several times, and his favorite actor again in the great rôle of Deffores in *The Changeling*. The dates of Pepys's visits during this period are: February 9, 23; March 1, 2, 16, 19, 25, 26; April 1, 2, 6. To these I think we can safely add the visit on January 29 to the "Blackfryers" and the three acts of *The Maid in the Mill*.

HAZELTON SPENCER

STATE COLLEGE OF WASHINGTON

¹ Witness Herbert's order to the Cockpit players (October 13, 1660) to reduce their charges to the scale of the old Blackfriars company (Adams, pp. 93-94). Also the reference to Blackfriars plays in the Restoration play lists, as reprinted by Mr. Nicoll in his *Restoration Drama*, e.g. (p. 314), "Whereas Sr William Davenant, Knight hath humbly presented to us a proposition of reforming some of the most ancient Playes that were played at Blackfriars . . ."; (p. 315): "A Catalogue of part of His Ma^{ties} Servants Playes as they were formerly acted at the Blackfryers and now allowed of to his Ma^{ties} Servants at y^e New Theatre." Is it possible that in concluding that the Theater Royal of the Restoration was the heir of the pre-Wars Blackfriars company Mr. Nicoll has attached any significance to these references?

THE INFLUENCE OF MARLOWE'S SOURCES ON *TAMBURLAINE I*

In *The Academy* for October 20, 1883, Professors C. H. Herford and A. Wagner announced that Marlowe's sources for *Tamburlaine I* were Mexia's *Sylva de varia lecion* (Seville, 1543), Part II, chapter xiv, and Perondinus' *Vita Magni Tamerlanis* (Florence, 1551); that Mexia's work, translated in 1571 from Spanish into English under the title *The Foreste, or Collection of Histories* and reprinted in 1576, was Marlowe's chief source of information, though Perondinus furnished some additional details; and that, though Marlowe followed history in keeping to its chronology, he added Zenocrate and made Tamburlaine more imposing and terrible than history did. Since this important announcement, the potent influence of these sources on Marlowe's first drama has not been discussed. I shall try to show (1) their meagerness, which, forcing on Marlowe liberties that he used and even overstepped, nevertheless made the sources binding; and (2) their influence in giving the play most of its so-called Marlowesque features.

I

Marlowe's sources for *Tamburlaine I* were potent, chiefly because the facts they reported were few and well known. Although Europe had been astonished by the conquests of Tamburlaine, which ended only shortly before his death in 1405, there was no adequate account of his life until 1595,¹ almost a decade after Marlowe's play was written. Mexia, writing in 1543, complained that he had had to piece together scraps of information, "scarce lendyng you any shewe of his conquirous exploytes, the same also confusely, and with out any order."² A very short account—only about one-sixth as long as Plutarch's life of Coriolanus or of Antonius—is the result of his study. The history of Perondinus, though four times as long, furnishes only a few additional incidents, and some military details ill adapted to the stage.

¹ Jean du Bec, *Histoire du grand Tamerlan*.

² *The Foreste* (1571), p. 83.

Scantiness of information forced Marlowe, not only to use every scrap of material, and so to write a chronicle play, but to invent and elaborate. The meager historical basis for the first two acts follows:

Of whiche newes [Tamburlaine's robberies] in the ende, the Kinge of Persia advertised, sent forth under the conducte of one, of his capitaines, a thousande horses well appointed to apprehende and take hym; at whose com-mynge, he so well knewe in this matter howe to beare hym, that of his enimie he soone had made hym, his assured frende, and companion; in suche sorte that they ioigned both their companies together, attempting, then before, enterprises much more greate, and more difficill. In the meane tyme a certaine discorde or breache of amitie grewe, betwixte the Kyng of Persia and his brother, by occasion where of Tamburlaine tooke parte with the Kynges brother, where he so ordered the matter in suche sorte, that he deposed the King, and advaunched the other. After this, by this newe prince, in recompence of his service, he was ordained generall of the greater parte of his armie, who under pretexte that he woulde conquire, and subdue, other provinces to the Persians, mustered still, and gathered, more Souldiars at hys pleasure, with whom he so practised that they easely revolted like Rebels followyng hym, subduyng their Leage, and Soveraigne. Thus havynge nowe deposed, whom he before advaunched, he crowned hymself Kyng, and Lorde of that country.¹

From this undetailed account Marlowe constructed nine scenes, creating from scarcely a hint the court of the silly Mycetes in Act I, and the seven military scenes of Act II.

The very lack of sequence that Mexia deplored aided the dramatist. It was by effective arrangement of incidents loosely related to the main narrative in time and place that Marlowe built up a climax in the last two acts. With an indefinite fairy-tale beginning, Mexia introduces a gruesome incident:

On a tyme beseigynge, a strong and riche citie, which neither on the first, or second would yelde to him, which only daies, were daies of mercie, . . . on the third day nevertheless affyng on hope uncertaine, to obtaine at his handes some mercie, and pardon, opened their gates, sendyng forth in order towardes hym, all their wemen, and children in white appareled, bearing eche in their handes a branche of Olive, cryng with haute voice, humbly requestynge, and demaundyng pardon, in maner so pitifull, and lamentable to beholde, that besides him none other was but woulde have accepted their solemne submission. This Tamburlaine, notwithstanding that beheld theim a farre of, in this order issuing, so farre then exiled from all kinde of pitie, that he

¹ *The Forests*, p. 83. U's and v's are modernized when *The Forests* is quoted.

commaunded forthwith, a certaine troope of horsemen to over runne, to murder, and kill theym, not leauyng one a live, of what condition soever, and after sackyng the Citie, rased it, even unto the verie foundations.¹

The dramatist was also at liberty to attach to the story of any siege Tamburlaine's custom of signaling his foes with white, red, and black flags. Into any part of the play after the capture of Bajazeth, Marlowe could insert details of Tamburlaine's cruelty to the Turk. Thus the three most striking incidents of Tamburlaine's life were at the service of dramatic purpose. Yet, though the sources were so meager² as to allow invention, even necessitate it, and so indefinite in time and place as to permit effective rearrangement of material, they were at the same time so few, striking, and well known that they gave the play its most distinctive features—except, of course, literary style, for which the author is responsible.

Lest their influence be imputed to the dramatist's historical fidelity, it is necessary to show that when Marlowe wrote *Tamburlaine I*, he had only perfunctory respect for fact. He evidently considered his obligation to history discharged if he recorded chronologically the main historical events.

That his distortion of fact was due to conscious will and not to forgetfulness is certain; for minute correspondences between play and history show that Marlowe had his sources at hand or freshly in mind when he wrote. In mentioning Tamburlaine's pride in the appearance of his camp,³ as well as his foolish foes' reliance on its being lawless,⁴ Marlowe evidently had in mind the orderliness of Tamburlaine's camp, described in *The Foreste* as so well conducted that it "resembled one of the best, and richest Cities of the worlde, for all kinde of offices were there founde in order, as also greate heapes of marchauntes to furnishe it with all necessaries. He in no case permitted any robberies, privie figgyng, force, or violence."⁵ The send-

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 86.

² The main narrative for the last two acts is a mere catalogue of conquered territories: "Now this greate Tamburlaine, this mightie Prince and Emperour, over ranne all Asia the lesse, to the Turke before subject, thence turning towards Egypte, conquered also Syria, Phenicia, and Palestine, with all other Cities on their borders, of what side so ever, and besides these Smirna, Antioch, Tripolis, Sebasta, and Damascus. Afterwarde being come with al his arme into Egypte, the Soudan, and the kyng of Arabia, with sundrie other Princes, assembled altogether, and presented hym battalle, but in the ende to their inspecable detremet discomfited, were slaine, and spoiled at the pleasure of the ennemie; yb meane whereof the Soudan saved hymself by flight."—*The Foreste*, p. 85.

³ III, iii, 8-10.

⁴ II, ii, 44-46.

⁵ *The Foreste*, p. 84.

ing of emissaries to beg Tamburlaine's mercy upon the besieged city is preceded in the play, as in Perondinus, by the battering down of the walls.¹ The plundering of Damascus, recorded in Perondinus, is mentioned in the play, to which it is inessential.² Hauling Bajazeth about in an iron cage, using him as a footstool, feeding him on crumbs from the table, Marlowe took over from history. Two details found only in Perondinus, Bajazeth's braining himself on the bars of his cage, and the service exacted of Bajazeth's wife, are cited by Professors Herford and Wagner as proof that Perondinus was one of Marlowe's authorities.³ Perondinus' suggestion of the ridicule heaped on Bajazeth, Marlowe elaborated. He retained the exhortation against pride,⁴ with which both historians⁵ conclude the account of Bajazeth's fall.

That these correspondences, though numerous enough to show minute acquaintance with the sources, do not indicate a meticulousness akin to Shakespeare's is shown by discrepancies in statistical and geographical data. Though the sources for *Tamburlaine* are rich in statistics, most of Marlowe's estimates of the size of armies came from his head. Tamburlaine's force of "three hundred thousand men in armour clad,"⁶ and "five hundred thousand footmen threatening shot,"⁷ is to be found in neither history; nor the opposing force of

A hundred and fifty thousand horse;

Two hundred thousand foot, brave men-at-arms;⁸

nor Cosroe's twenty thousand men.⁹ Though Perondinus fills pages with names of conquered territories, there is no correspondence between them and the decorative, high-sounding lists of geographical names in *Tamburlaine I* and *II*.

Had the deviations of Marlowe from history been confined to minutiae of numbers, names, and other minor details, his place among the historically faithful might be moderately high, for there was an enormous difference in meticulousness among Elizabethan playwrights. When, however, Act III of *Tamburlaine I* so distorts the

¹ V, 1, 2; Perondinus, p. 43.

² IV, II, 106-10; Perondinus, p. 39.

³ *The Academy* (Oct. 20, 1883), pp. 265 ff.

⁴ "Prudenti vero et commessanti, quo magis ridiculo foret, et despiciatui, micas et frustilla sub mensa tripodii alligatus canis in modum comedere cogebatur" (p. 30).

⁵ *The Foresta*, p. 85; Perondinus, p. 31.

⁶ IV, I, 21.

⁷ IV, I, 24.

⁸ IV, III, 53-54.

⁹ II, v, 91.

most tremendous struggle of the hero's life as to make it seem quite other than it was, and Acts IV and V hold up as most important an invention of the dramatist concerning Tamburlaine, subordinating to it the historical events, one can hardly call the play a "true historie" of Tamburlaine.

Act III presents Tamburlaine's victory over Bajazeth, which in *The Foreste* is recorded as follows:

[Bajazeth left Constantinople] passyng thence into Asia with all his armie, taking uppe still by the way, as many as was possible, so that as some affirme, he had as many horsemen as had the greate Tamburlaine: . . . Wherefore marchyng on within fewe daies, they mette eache with other upon the confines of Armenia, where both of them orderyng as became good Capitaines their people, beganne in the breake of day, the most cruell, and most terrible battaile that earst was ever harde of, considering the number on both partes, . . . with the valiant currage and prowes of their capitaines. Thus continued they in fight even almoste untill night, with merveilous sloughter on bothe sides, the victorie yet doubtfull, til, in the ende the Turkes beganne to fainte and to flee, more in deede opprest with the multitude, then that thei feared or other wise, the moste parte of them with honour dyng manfully in the filde; and as one reporteth two hundred thousand were taken prisoners, after the battaile was ended, the resude slaine, and fledde for their better safetie. Whiche Baiaceth, of parte perceivying before the ende, how it would waie, to courage his people, and to withdrawe theim from flight, resisted in person valiantly the furious rage of the enimie. How be it, he therby gained such, and so many knokes, that as he was in the ende, in deede unhорste, so was he for lake of reskewe presented to the greate Tamburlaine, who incontinently closed hym uppe, in a kaege of yron, carrynge hym still with hym, whither soever he after wente.¹

The importance of the battle and its confusion and carnage are here set forth seriously. In the play the details and manner of treatment are changed. The result is that, while Marlowe follows history in letting the audience know that Tamburlaine fought and defeated Bajazeth, he makes a farce of Tamburlaine's most difficult encounter.

Acts IV and V present two military exploits and two of Tamburlaine's most widely known atrocities. These historical events are, however, the background for an entirely unhistorical interest, built around Zenocrate. The dramatic climax does not concern the question of chief interest in the histories: Will Tamburlaine conquer his

¹ *The Foreste*, pp. 84-85.

enemies? but one quite foreign to historical conception of Tamburlaine's character: Will Tamburlaine's love for Zenocrate conquer his pride in military rigor?

These two big changes, which transform three-fifths of the dramatic chronicle, are more than mere padding of meager material. They change the tone of the narrative.

II

Though Marlowe's historical conscience was not an exacting one, the distinguishing characteristics of *Tamburlaine I*—unifying hero, episodic action, spectacle, monotony, striking incident—qualities generally regarded as emanations from the energetic dramatist, were, in truth, the unavoidable molding of history. Once Marlowe had chosen his subject, he could not escape presenting the few well-known facts about Tamburlaine, nor could he hope to vie with them in interest. The dramatic qualities due to his initiative are, then (in contrast with his literary style, famous for its effective use of blank verse and rhetoric), relatively inconspicuous. Yet they throw some light on his tastes and abilities.

Left by meager sources¹ with more than twenty characters to create, Marlowe demonstrated his originality by falling back on only one stock character, Agydas, who, however, in his brief appearances justifies his dramatic existence—being Zenocrate's confidant; giving Tamburlaine opportunity to show the fierceness of his eye and the sudden consequences of his anger; furnishing, too, an exhibition, dear to the Elizabethan audience, of brave dying. Marlowe also demonstrated his ability to make his characters distinct. The feeble Mycetes is not at all like his generous, trustful brother. Neither of them resembles the haughty Bajazeth or the amorous king of Arabia. Tamburlaine's hardy follower, Techelles, is less likely to be visited by compunctions and doubts than the more wavering Theridamas. But they lack vitality.

The shadowiness of Marlowe's minor characters, in contrast with the vividness of the hero, suggests two explanations. One is that Marlowe's elaborative genius needed a hint to fire it, and consequently that Tamburlaine, whom Marlowe found already characterized in

¹ *The Foresta* mentions by name and characterizes only two people: Bajazeth, whom Marlowe so completely changed as to make him totally fictitious, and Tamburlaine.

history, has vividness, while the others, whom Marlowe created, do not—a theory which will in part account for the distinctness of minor characters in *Edward II*, a drama based on the peopleful chronicles of Holinshed, and for the unreality even of major characters in *Tamburlaine II* and *The Jew of Malta*, which are largely Marlowe's fabrication.

The other explanation is that a sense for proportion and emphasis, which his classical training would accentuate, led Marlowe to animate characters according to their importance. Tamburlaine, the spring of all action, has vibrant personality, while others have varying degrees of vitality. The variation of vitality according to dramatic importance is well illustrated by one character, Zenocrate, who is sometimes necessary to the action and sometimes insignificant to it. Marlowe had little need of her at the beginning of the play. In the first two acts, where he followed closely the events of history, he inserted Zenocrate only occasionally; in the last two acts, where he rearranged his details to effect for Tamburlaine an emotional climax built on her grief, and where consequently her existence has dramatic significance, he introduced her often. At the beginning of the play, Zenocrate is wooden. Upon her first appearance she talks little, her longest speech being expository. She does not appear again until the second scene of Act III, where her confession of love for Tamburlaine, is loaded with unnatural, classical elaboration, in Senecan fashion:

As looks the Sun through Nilus' flowing stream,
Or when the Morning holds him in her arms,
So looks my lordly love, fair Tamburlaine;
His talk much sweeter than the Muses' song
They sung for honour 'gainst Pierides;
Or when Minerva did with Neptune strive:
And higher would I rear my estimate
Than Juno, sister to the highest god,
If I were matched with mighty Tamburlaine.¹

In Acts IV and V, however, she obtains through her sufferings an enlargement of sympathy that gives depth to her character. Often she talks naturally. Sincerity marks the speech in which she laments the tardiness of her pity for Bajazeth and his wife. Her trembling fear for her father and for Tamburlaine is convincing. That she becomes a

¹ III, II, 47-55.

living person only in that part of the play to which she is essential shows in Marlowe a feeling for emotional unity and dramatic climax.

Emotional intensity and regard for dramatic climax may also explain his handling of historical precept. The historians, finding the ruthless, yet successful, Tamburlaine an unfruitful subject for moralizing, based their precept on the fall of Bajazeth. Effectively the sententious Mexia exhorts:

Whence assuredly we may learne not so much to affie in riches, or in the pompe of this world: for as muche as he that yesterdaie was Prince and Lorde, of all the worlde almost, is this daie fallen into suche extreame miserie, that he liveth worse then a dogge, fellowe to theim in companie, and that by the meanes of him that was some tymes a poore Sheaperde or if you rather will, as some reporte, a meane souldiour, who after as we see aspired to suche honour, that in hys time none . . . durst, or coulede abide hym: the other that descended of noble race or lineage, constrained to live an abiecte, in most lothsum and vile servitude. This tragidie might suffice, to withdrawe men, from this transitorie pompe, and honour, acquaintyng themselves with Heaven and with heavenly thinges onely.¹

Marlowe put this moral into the mouth of Zenocrate, newly come upon the dead bodies of Bajazeth and his wife Zabina, and fearing a like fate for Tamburlaine or her father. With her Senecan confession of love in mind, one expects a sermon of grave sententiousness; but finds, instead, generalization made concrete and saturated with emotion:

Blush, Heaven, that gave them honour at their birth
And let them die a death so barbarous!
Those that are proud of fickle empery
And place their chiefest good in earthly pomp,
Behold the Turk and his great Emperess!
Ah, Tamburlaine! my love! sweet Tamburlaine!
That fight'st for sceptres and for slippery crowns,
Behold the Turk and his great Emperess!
Thou, that in conduct of thy happy stars
Sleep'st every night with conquests on thy brows,
And yet would'st shun the wavering turns of war,
In fear and feeling of the like distress
Behold the Turk and his great Emperess!
Ah, mighty Jove and holy Mahomet,
Pardon my love!—Oh, pardon his contempt
Of earthly fortune and respect of pity,

And let not conquest, ruthlessly pursued,
 Be equally against his life incensed
 In this great Turk and hapless Emperess!
 And pardon me that was not moved with ruth
 To see them live so long in misery!
 Ah, what may chance to thee, Zenocrate?¹

Here Mexia's moral, though eloquently expressed, has lost emphasis. The reason is plain. It is subordinated to emotion. Though, as in history, the fall of princes is the subject and Bajazeth the example, what gets the reader's attention is Zenocrate's agony of remorse and her fear for a lover and a father. The passage stirs agitation rather than reflection.

The sight of historical moral half smothered by emotion in an age addicted to sententiousness is an oddity, not satisfactorily explained by the suggestions, sometimes made, that Marlowe was over-anxious for cheap popularity, a favor he scouted in the Prologue to *Tamburlaine I*; or that the audience would not submit to philosophical disquisition (Senecan tragedies and the moralities had taught both the upper and lower classes to expect a sententiousness which Marlowe's later contemporaries, the popular Chapman and Shakespeare, used copiously); or that Marlowe disliked sententiousness. Though the speech of the weak king Mycetes to his captain:

Go frowning forth; but come thou smiling home,
 As did Sir Paris with the Grecian dame;
 Return with speed—time passeth swift away;
 Our life is frail, and we may die to-day,²

in its mock-sententiousness may easily provoke amused contempt, not only for the foolish Mycetes, but for the practice of lugging in platitudes, there is nothing else in the play to indicate that Marlowe had any distinct aversion to moral precept. He did not try to evade Mexia's moral or to make fun of it. He left it where it was in the story, and gave it dignified expression. In the last two acts, however, he was preoccupied with emotion; and the moral is overwhelmed.

Emotional intensity and humor seldom are found in peaceful and successful union. In *Tamburlaine I*, however, farce and humor, both of them Marlowe's addition to the story, are not permitted to

¹ V, II, 289-310.

² I, I, 65-68.

interfere with emotional intensity. No gleam of fun lightens the awful pages of the histories Marlowe consulted. But in the play there is considerable levity. Marlowe, who had good reason for not wanting to treat seriously Tamburlaine's struggle with the formidable Bajazeth, made a farce of it. Instead of the glory of great deeds and brave men, Act III presents as its struggle a comical boasting contest between the two kings, their followers, their wives, and their wives' servants, the ludicrousness of which is reinforced by carefully balanced speeches. Bajazeth has become a cowardly, ridiculous braggart. Thus in the central act and in the most important figure, Tamburlaine excepted, Marlowe weakened the heroic that he found in the histories, replacing the dignified by the farcical.

Tamburlaine I is sometimes spoken of as a play without humor. Yet Marlowe's foisting utter absurdity on the Persian potentate, Tamburlaine's first royal foe, whom the histories leave uncharacterized, shows not only a taste for the comic but considerable comic initiative.

Mycetes, who, impotent as the shadow of a king, swears revenge "by this my royal seat. . . . Embossed with silk,"¹ is the precursor to a long line of faint-hearted weaklings who complain against their foes with much the same petulance he does:

I tell you true, my heart is swoln with wrath
On this same thievish villain, Tamburlaine,
And on that false Cosroe, my traitorous brother.
Would it not grieve a king to be so abused
And have a thousand horsemen ta'en away?
And, which is worse, to have his diadem
Sought for by such scald knaves as love him not?²

His concern to be considered wise, shown in such speeches as

And through your planets I perceive you think
I am not wise enough to be a king;
But I refer me to my noblemen
That know my wit, and can be witnesses,³

and shown, too, in his supreme ridiculousness, where, seeking to hide his crown during the battle, he says,

¹ I, I, 97-99.

² II, II, 2-8.

³ I, I, 19-23.

. . . . a goodly strategem,
 And far from any man that is a fool:
 So shall I not be known; or if I be,
 They cannot take away my crown from me.
 Here will I hide it in this simple hole,¹

links him with many another fool, among them the yet unborn Sir Andrew Aguecheek, who concludes that eating beef "does harm to my wit,"² and confesses, "I am a fellow o' th' strangest mind i' th' world."³

Yet, though a successful comic character, Mycetes is essential to the main narrative and does not distract attention from it. Unlike Bessus, Captain Bobadill, Sir Toby, and Sir Andrew, all inessential to any main plot and barely attached to it, Mycetes is important to the rise of Tamburlaine. As he is the first obstacle in Tamburlaine's path, his weakness, ridiculous in itself, is essential to the hero's rise. Unlike the clownage Marlowe inveighed against, which was almost as successful in distracting attention from romance and high deeds as Ralph in *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*, Mycetes never usurps first place. Malvolio stars in *Twelfth Night*, Beatrice and Benedict in *Much Ado*. In the first two acts of *Henry IV*, Falstaff outshines Prince Hal. But Mycetes, whose part ends with Act II, never distracts attention from Tamburlaine; nor can he interrupt intensity of feeling, for no great emotional climax is attempted until the fourth act. With his tragic end not depicted on the stage or even suggested pointedly, he remains one of the few humorous characters of Elizabethan drama intrinsic to the central story and yet subordinate to it.

Humor, farce, many minor characters, lack of sententiousness—these, as they are Marlowe's deviations from history, should show most clearly the taste of the dramatist. Beyond showing his regard for emotional unity and climax, however, they are disappointingly inconspicuous.

So, too, are the contrast and spectacle Marlowe is responsible for, compared with that which history furnished. The three most spectacular episodes in the play were well-known historical facts: (1) the murder of emissaries sent from a besieged city; (2) the ill

¹ II, iv, 11-15.

² *Twelfth Night*, I, iii, 81.

³ *Ibid.*, II, 101-2.

treatment of Bajazeth, and (3) Tamburlaine's display of flags. The last two are briefly reported in *The Foreste*.

So was he for lake of reskewe presented to the greate Tamburlaine, who incontinently closed hym uppe, in a Kaege of yron, carrynge hym still with hym, whither soever he after wente, pasturyng hym with the croomes, that fell from hys table, and with other hadde morselles, as he had been a dogge.¹

It is written of him, that in all his assaultes, of any castell or citie, he usually would hang out to be seen of the enimie, an Enseigne white for the space of one full daie, whiche signified, (as was then to all men well knownen) that if those within, woulde in that daye yelde theim, he then woulde take theim to mercie, without any their losse of life or goods. The seconde daie hee did to bee hanged out an other all redde, lettynge theym thereby againe to understande, that if they then woulde yelde, he onelie then woulde execute th' officers, Magistrates, maisters of housholdes, and governours, pardonyng, and forgevyng all others whatsoever. The thirde daie he ever displaid, the thirde all blacke, signifyng therby, that he then hadde shutte up his gates from all compassion and clemencie, in such sorte, that whosoever were in that daie taken, or in anie other then followyng, shoulde assuredly die for it, without any respecte, either of man, or woman, little or greate, the Citie to be sackt, and burnt withall to ashes: whence assuredly it can not be saide, but that he was verie cruell, though otherwise adorned with many rare vertues.²

In juxtaposition with these essential and overpowering spectacles, Marlowe's own inventions flash pale. Chief among them are Tamburlaine's discarding, on his first appearance, his shepherd's weeds for complete armor and curtal ax (I, ii, 41-43); his display of captured treasure to dazzle Theridamas (I, ii, 181); the two naked daggers that were offered to Agydas (III, ii, 88); the messenger whom Bajazeth boasted he would come and get if Tamburlaine did not comply with his terms (III, i, 40); and the hand-to-hand fight between Tamburlaine and Bajazeth (III, iii, 212). Crowns, unmentioned in the sources, are conspicuous in the play; and are displayed in ways so unique as to give them special emphasis. While Marlowe's additions to dramatic spectacle do not lack significance, they are dazzling trappings rather than meaningful episodes.

Nor is Marlowe responsible for the play's outstanding contrasts; they are not rhetorical devices, but facts. The major difference between Tamburlaine and his enemies—indeed, the only one history set forth—was this: he won; they lost. Marlowe dwelt longest, as

¹ P. 85.

² P. 86.

the histories did, on the fall of Bajazeth. Where history reported that Tamburlaine used Bajazeth's neck as a stirrup in mounting his horse, Marlowe had Tamburlaine use it significantly as a step to his throne. This slight change, however, only enforces the historical contrast between success and failure.

It is the differences of personality that Marlowe added: the contrast of Tamburlaine with what his enemies thought of him; and the contrast of Tamburlaine with people who were in many respects like him. After one has heard from the foes of Tamburlaine that he is a base-born thief, his princeliness and generosity are the more arresting. After one sees Tamburlaine with people who have the same aims he has, his excellencies shine out. Both Tamburlaine and the weakling Mycetes, for example, have an excellent opinion of themselves; both take delight in high station; both are fascinated by a crown. These points of likeness serve only to light up the fact that the men behind the desires are totally different. The common quality of courage in Tamburlaine and his follower Techelles brings out another contrast. When the hardy Tamburlaine proposes to parley with an enemy, Techelles says,

No: cowards and faint-hearted runaways
Look for orations when the foe is near:
Our swords shall play the orator for us;¹

and shows himself a bluff soldier, nothing more; while Tamburlaine, eager and able in diplomacy, stands out the richer character. The boasting in which both Tamburlaine and his foes indulge emphasizes the enormous difference in efficiency—a historical fact—between them and him. As Theridamas suggests:

You hear, my lord, what working words he hath;
But when you see his actions top his speech, . . . ?

but the Turks "menace more than they can well perform." Where Fletcher's total contrasts portrayed the soft courtier as utterly unlike the hardy warrior, and the eloquent coward totally unlike the inarticulate hero, Marlowe, with his more discriminating method, could show salient characteristics and yet portray a many-sided personality.

These two methods of contrast—providing a background of odium against which to set a shining hero, and giving Tamburlaine richness

¹ I, II, 130-32.

² II, III, 25-26.

of character as well as distinctness—are much more subtle than the contrast between success and failure commonly attributed to him.

The distinctive dramatic qualities, commonly attributed to Marlowe and to his first play, the sources furnished. Striking incident, for which Marlowe and *Tamburlaine I* are noted, history made necessary; for Tamburlaine's life was one of warfare and of barbarous deeds. Of the hero's many military adventures Marlowe succeeded in using five. With two martial exploits in the second act, one in the third, and two in the last two acts, the dramatist was able to satisfy his countrymen's zest for martial excitement. Tamburlaine's well-known atrocities—keeping Bajazeth in an iron cage, and ordering the slaughter of suppliants from a besieged city—Marlowe had to present because they were well known. By incorporating them he not only satisfied the expectations of the Elizabethan audience assembled to see precisely those infamous barbarities, but gave the play its most memorable episodes. "An audience," says Mr. Lytton Strachey, in discussing the work of a nineteenth-century Elizabethan, Beddoes, "whose attention is held and delighted by a succession of striking incidents clothed in splendid speech, neither cares nor knows whether the effect of the whole is worthy of its separate parts."¹ It is thus that Marlowe held and delighted his audience; but where Beddoes' incidents, the fantastic emanation of an erratic brain, are curious and unconvincing, Marlowe's, the representation of fact, are real and gripping.

History also offered opportunity for a brief scene of pathos, which, being brief, has been almost smothered by Dyce's assertion that *Tamburlaine I* was a play "with no pathos where pathos was to be expected." It is the death scene of Tamburlaine's proud enemy, Bajazeth. The details Marlowe got from Perondinus, but doubled the tragic effect of Bajazeth's miserable end by adding to it the frenzy and suicide of Bajazeth's wife. Though the Bajazeth of Marlowe's third act is a coward and a braggart, the very load of his wretchedness finally lends him dignity. His telling summary of his woes, his unselfish thought for his wife, his caressing words to her before he kills himself, her madness and death, followed by Zenocrate's first rush of pity for them, all work up a short scene of sincere pathos. That it is

¹ *Books and Characters*, p. 257.

less developed and less significant to the drama than Marlowe's picture, so praised by Hazlitt, of Edward II's misery, or the final scene of *Doctor Faustus*, is at once obvious. But comparison of this slashing play and its little climax of sorrow with dramas where pathos is a necessary accompaniment to the tragic fate of the main character should not minimize Marlowe's achievement in developing this scene of pathos in the midst of Tamburlaine's victorious career.

Unfortunately, history bequeathed to the play some flaws. One is monotony; what some critics have called "endless repetition." Immediately this defect is mentioned, one recalls in *Tamburlaine* a succession of military adventures, and forgets perhaps that in a chronicle play which follows the career of a successful warrior some repetition is inevitable. The historical Tamburlaine was always fighting and was always victorious. For this monotony Marlowe cannot be blamed unless he shows himself content with it.

Confronted with the task of setting forth five conflicts—and one need only recall the hastily constructed Part II to realize how prone to monotony the depicting of conquest is—Marlowe achieved in Part I considerable variety. The center of interest in each conquest is different. The victory over Mycetes, the Persian king, is memorable for the contrast between Mycetes and Tamburlaine; that over Cosroe, Mycetes' brother, for Tamburlaine's attainment of kingly power; the defeat of Bajazeth, for its boasting match; the fall of Damascus, for its portrayal of Tamburlaine's cruelty; the victory over the Sultan of Egypt and the King of Arabia, for the struggle within Tamburlaine between the pride in the inviolability of military practices and love for Zenocrate.

The conflicts themselves are made different by the characters of Tamburlaine's antagonists. Even the deaths of Tamburlaine's foes are diverse. Of the three who are killed on the stage, Cosroe dies of wounds, cursing Tamburlaine; the King of Arabia, knowing he is mortally wounded, dies happy, because he thinks he still has the love of Zenocrate; and Bajazeth kills himself in despair.

Perhaps it is in the display of crowns, his own addition, that Marlowe ran into the greatest danger of monotony. Yet he did much to vary Tamburlaine's evident delight in winning crowns. In the first encounter, Tamburlaine leaves with the silly Mycetes the crown that

worthless potentate had wanted to hide in a "simple hole"; he snatches the crown of Persia from the head of the dead Cosroe; one of his followers seizes the crown of the defeated Bajazeth from the Turk's wife, and gives it to Zenocrate; Tamburlaine orders crowns served as the second course of a feast; his last command is the crowning of Zenocrate.

Knowledge of *Tamburlaine's* sources exposes the pains Marlowe took to give his play variety. Finding in the histories many conquests and many misfortunes for Tamburlaine's antagonists, most of whom are undifferentiated, Marlowe displayed much ingenuity in making this succession of similar events as dissimilar as possible. The repetition is inherent in his sources; the variety is the dramatist's.

The historical material is responsible, too, for episodic action, the chief defect in the unity of the play, and for a strong hero, the play's most effective unifying force. For the unifying force Marlowe has been given great credit. As evidence of his originality or desire for unity, however, the hero's dominance of all action is valueless; for the historical accounts on which the play is based give Tamburlaine the same lonely dominance that the drama does and the same desire for martial glory. In *The Foreste* only one other character, his chief adversary, Bajazeth, is mentioned by name. In both histories Tamburlaine stalks about Asia, a solitary and gigantic figure bent on military conquest. It would have been difficult for Marlowe not to give his play the unity of one personality with one ambition. In so doing, he was merely dramatizing his sources.

There is evidence, however, that he deprecated the play's disjointed, episodic action, which made unity impossible. In the historical accounts there are three centers of interest, each unrelated to the others: (1) the steps by which Tamburlaine rose to the Persian throne; (2) Tamburlaine's victory over Bajazeth; and (3) Tamburlaine's subsequent conquests. The conqueror is the only link between them. Marlowe, who followed history in presenting important events in their chronological order, set forth Tamburlaine's rise in Acts I and II; Bajazeth's fall in Act III; and other important conquests in Acts IV and V. Had Marlowe been content with the formlessness of the chronicle play, the dramatic Tamburlaine would again have been the only link connecting the three distinct divisions.

Marlowe, however, made two attempts to secure further connection between the separate units. The first and third divisions he tried to link through Zenocrate. Instead of the Persian woman history mentions as Tamburlaine's wife, Zenocrate is the daughter of the Sultan of Egypt and the fiancée of the King of Arabia. As these two rulers were Tamburlaine's foes in the last two acts of the play, the fictitious relationship between them and Zenocrate, together with the capture of Zenocrate in Act I, gives motive for their expedition against Tamburlaine and reason for Zenocrate's pitiable anxiety.

Perhaps because what she connects is far apart and she is of little importance in the first three acts, Zenocrate is a weaker link than Bajazeth, who strengthens the connection between the second and third parts of the action. Bajazeth, the important figure of Act III, Marlowe carried over into the last two acts to serve as a recurring illustration of Tamburlaine's cruelty. In Act III, Bajazeth is defeated and captured. Through Acts IV and V, where military interests are subordinated to Zenocrate's fear for her father, Bajazeth is suffering starvation, ridicule, and shame. His misery becomes more and more intense until it rises, in the scene with his wife just before his death, to a climax of woe. They kill themselves. Anippe, the maid, coming on their dead bodies, says to Zenocrate,

This their slavery hath enforced,
And ruthless cruelty of Tamburlaine;¹

and Zenocrate grieves the more lest a like fate befall her father or Tamburlaine.

Though unity of time is impossible, Marlowe compressed the action into a comparatively brief time by making events which were spread out over Tamburlaine's long life occur within the time limit of an ardent courtship—a few months, one would guess, certainly not more than a year or two.

It is not, then, Tamburlaine's dominance of the play that betrays in Marlowe a desire for unity, but the dramatist's struggle to connect totally unconnected episodes and to abridge the time they really occupied. Never again (and this, in part, accounts for the improvement noted by Professor W. D. Briggs in the construction of Marlowe's plays)² did Marlowe work with material so stubborn. In *Tam-*

¹ V, ii, 284-85.

² Marlowe's *Edward II*, pp. xciii ff.

burlaine II and *The Jew of Malta*, both largely his fabrication, he was tied to very few facts. The Faustus legend may have reached him informally by word of mouth. Holinshed offered so much material for *Edward II* that the dramatist could make artistic selection. Quite different from any of these were the accounts of Tamburlaine. Meager, yet exacting, they determined the major defects and excellencies in the unity of the play. The unyielding character of his material considered, Marlowe showed in his first play a promising sense of form.

Tamburlaine I, when compared with the histories on which it is based, is a valuable guide to young Marlowe's dramatic aims, because it shows Marlowe before his tastes were affected by the enormous popularity of his first play or by adverse criticism made upon it. With the exception of literary style, the qualities in *Tamburlaine I* for which he is most clearly responsible are those for which he is least famed. His invention of character we scarcely consider. Accustomed to the character-full plays of Elizabethan times, few of us realize how many people Marlowe had to supply from his imagination. His lack of sententiousness in an age when practice and theory agreed that drama should teach, critics have noted as a minor detail. His insertion of humor is almost unnoticed; the farce in Act III is seldom mentioned. His efforts to secure some unity and variety in spite of his stubborn material are unrecognized. The glittering tinsel he really added to the showiness of the play is not what we think of when spectacle in *Tamburlaine* is mentioned. His adroitness we do not catch sight of when we think of his contrasts. Yet all these are Marlowe's actual additions to his material or deviations from it; and in them we see what Marlowe liked and what he thought a drama should be.

What we think of as salient in the play and characteristic in the author the sources furnished: (1) one predominating figure with one ambition; (2) episodic action; (3) violent incident; (4) monotony; (5) significant spectacle, compared with which Marlowe's additions are gaudy trappings; and (6) a succession of contrasts between the victor and the vanquished, which do not compare in subtle force with Marlowe's use of contrast. Most of these qualities, which *Tamburlaine I* inherited from its historical sources, distinguish Marlowe's

later plays; they are a conspicuous part of his surviving literary reputation.

In these days of mechanistic explanations of personality and accomplishment, one need be very careful how he asserts the influence of anything on a man of genius, lest he be understood to imply that the thing is all important and the genius a mere name given a fortuitous, though pleasing, aggregation of such influences. Yet a thoughtful reading of Marlowe's sources for his play, *Tamburlaine I*, suggests the notion that while Marlowe's name would probably be as great among us as it is today, if his sources for *Tamburlaine* had been other than they were, he might not be credited with several qualities we regard as characteristic of him.

LESLIE SPENCE

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

NATIVE ELEMENTS IN ENGLISH NEO-CLASSICISM

In the present article I shall try to show that English neo-Classicism had its roots deep in native soil and that it was in harmony with certain manifestations of the English national genius that were especially prominent in the generation after 1660.

The Restoration brought back more than the House of Stuart. The continuity of English tradition and the rule of reason justified by precedent were also restored in England. The revolution had been completely successful against the king, but it had failed to establish a settled government giving permanent guaranty of the traditional rights of English freemen. British law and constitution alike rested upon the assumption that the government would be carried on by king, lords, and commons. The revolution had swept these aside, but it had not found anything satisfactory to take their place. During the Puritan *interregnum* England had been governed by men who had departed from immemorial tradition and the common ways of thought—men who desired to pursue ends not customary, and who held power by no prescriptive right.¹

Charles II was welcomed back to England as the outward and visible sign of the customary ways of government and of the traditional liberty of the British subject:

“read Sovereign! I offer no flattering Titles, but speak the Words of Truth: You are the desire of three Kingdoms, the Strength and Stay of the Tribes of the People, for the moderating of Extremities, the reconciling of Differences, the satisfying of all Interests, and for the restoring of the collapsed Honour of these Nations.”²

Ten years later, at an anniversary sermon, the Reverend John Lake, afterward Bishop of Chichester, praised God “for the happy Restoration of our Dread Sovereign to his Kingdoms, and therein of the Kingdoms themselves, to their Religion, Laws, Liberties, Proprieties again.”³ England, tired of novelty and excess and caprice,

¹ G. M. Trevelyan, *England under the Stuarts*, p. 272.

² *The Earl of Manchester's Speech to His Majesty, in the Name of the Peers, At his Arrival at White-Hall, The 29th of May, 1660*, London, 1660.

³ *A Sermon Preached at Whitehall upon the 29th of May, 1670. Being the day of His Majesties Birth and Happy Restoration. By John Lake, D.D. Late Rector of S. Botolphs without Bishopsgate*, London, 1670.

reacted toward constituted authority in church and state and society and literature. Dryden's poem in honor of the Restoration was happily named *Astræa Redux*.

It was natural that the spirit of the Restoration should be more conservative than that which had preceded the civil wars; there was more to react from. From the riotous individualism of the Puritan *interregnum* the nation now turned toward the general sense. Disgusted with lawlessness and eccentricity, it reacted toward rules; after enthusiasm and fanaticism, it welcomed sober judgment. The movement was thus conservative and restrictive, tempered by a sense of reason and moderation.

This moderate conservatism is illustrated in the development of English constitutional history after 1660. The lessons of the Civil War period and the protectorate were not forgotten. The reconstituted monarchy was a compromise between autocracy and popular sovereignty, between the tyranny of the monarch and the tyranny of the mob. England had suffered from both, and was learning to hold both in place by means of that intricate series of checks and balances, the developing British constitution. In general, the Whigs most feared the former and the Tories the latter; but both parties and all classes united in expressions of hatred for arbitrary power.

Charles II avowed this principle in his public utterances, and repeatedly declared himself an enemy to all arbitrary proceedings. In his speech at the opening of the Oxford Parliament in March, 1681, he said: "For I, who will never use Arbitrary Government My Self, am resolv'd not to suffer it in Others."¹

Halifax, in "The Character of a Trimmer," said:

Our Trimmer owneth a Passion for liberty, yet so restrained, that it doth not in the least impair or taint his Allegiance;²

and again:

The Crown hath power sufficient to protect our Liberties. The People have so much Liberty as is necessary to make them useful to the Crown.

Our Government is in a just proportion, no Tympany, no unnatural swelling either of Power or Liberty.³

¹ *His Majesties Most Gracious Speech to Both Houses of Parliament, At the Opening of the Parliament at Oxford Monday the 21st day of March 1681/1*, Oxford, n.d. The King's sincerity is not involved here. Whatever may have been Charles's real sentiments, his speech reflected the popular opinion; it was nicely adapted to the popular temper.

² *Complete Works* (ed. Raleigh), p. 61.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 62-63.

Dryden, in *The Medal*, emphasized British love of a just balance between the extremes "Of popular sway and arbitrary reign." Samuel Pordage, Dryden's opponent, gave an excellent expression of this moderate conservatism that seeks continuity rather than experiment.

For Innovation is a dangerous thing,
Whether it comes from People or from King.
To change Foundations which long Ages stood,
Which have prov'd firm, unshaken, sound, and good,
To pull all down, and cast the Frame anew,
Is work for Rebels, and for Tyrants too.¹

Such references could easily be multiplied. However sharply Whig (and Tory might differ from each other, both were agreed in resting their cases upon the English law and tradition, the natural constitution of society, and the judgment of reason.

In the English church we can see, no less clearly than in the state, a love of the middle way. On the one side was the Roman Catholic church, which stood for absolute authority and for centralized ecclesiastical government. On the other side were the dissenting sects, which stood for private judgment and for decentralized government. On the one side was respect for tradition, and ordered decorum in services; on the other, disrespect for tradition, and varying degrees of spontaneity and enthusiasm in public worship. In all these respects the Anglican church occupied a middle position. It held both to Catholic tradition and to the open Bible. In ecclesiastical government it rejected alike papal autocracy and independent anarchy. In its order of services it retained a ritual but discarded much ceremonial. The Roman Catholics accused it of rejecting truth; the sectaries accused it of retaining error. Anglican apologists thundered alike against Puritan and Papist, at all times condemning the excess of those who departed from the paths of moderation or who seemed to err by accepting too little or too much.²

Against the charges of novelty and singularity the Anglican divines were accustomed to appeal to the decrees of the earliest general councils, the writings of the Christian Fathers, and universal tradition.

¹ *Asarick and Hushai, A Poem* (London, 1682), p. 31.

² "We live secure from mad Enthusiastick Rage
And fond Tradition now grown blind with Age."—

THO. CREECH, "To Mr. Dryden on Religio Laici," prefixed to the 1682 ed. of *Religio Laici*.

Is not this
a too rigid
system of
pigeon-holing?
What? the
high- and low-
church groups?

Over and over again was the appeal made to Scripture, antiquity, and reason. On this combined basis was the church attacked and defended. Chamberlayne, in his description of the Church of England, puts the whole matter clearly, declaring

That she holds the whole truly Catholick Foundation according to the Scripture, and the four first general Councils; That she adheres closely to Tradition truly Universal; that is, doth willingly receive, quod ab omnibus, quod ubique, quod semper receptum fuit, which is the old Rule of Catholicism. . . . Search all the Religions in the World, none will be found more consonant to God's Word, for doctrine, nor to the Primitive example for Government . . . it keepeth the middle way, between the pomp of Superstitious Tyranny, and the meanness of Fanatick Anarchy.¹

The oft-repeated accusation against the dissenters was that they affected singularity and opposed authority.

Their speech & habits they cannot indure should be like their Neighbors, and are very curious to be in all things contrary to the common mode, so that they may be taken notice of for singular men . . . and are so stult with contradiction that they will do nothing commanded by Authority; so that the only way to have them do anything is to forbid them doing of it on pain of death.²

Here, as in other respects, the relations of church and state were far closer in the seventeenth century than they are today. Support of the king and the bishops usually went together; the sanctions of authority and tradition and reason were similar in church and in state. Of course men were not entirely consistent, but they could not have separated their politics and their religion even had they so desired. Both were parts of a habit of thought which affected their whole intellectual and social life. Long before the outbreak of the Civil War, Roger Ascham had written:

For he, that can neither like Aristotle in Logicke and Philosophie, nor Tullie in Rhetoricke and Eloquence, will, from these steppes, likelie enough presume, by like pride, to mount hier, to the misliking of greater matters: that is either in Religion to haue a dissentious head, or in the common wealth to haue a factious hart.³

In opposition to the obstinate eccentricity of the dissenters, we find the churchmen arguing for the general sense and universal consent. "Private opinion or fancy" was sharply disavowed by the

¹ Edward Chamberlayne, *Angliae Notitia, or The Present State of England* (15th ed.; London, 1684), p. 30. See also the letter of Jeremy Taylor to John Evelyn, Nov. 21, 1665, in *Diary and Correspondence of John Evelyn*, (ed. Bray), III, 208-9.

² Richard Head, *Proteus Redivivus* (London, 1675), p. 236.

³ Scholemaister (ed. Arber), p. 191.

I was hoping for
and a statement

bishops in their debate with the Presbyterian divines on the commission for the review of the Book of Common Prayer in 1661.¹ When in 1689 Edward Scater was publicly received back into the English church, after having left it for the Roman, he stated in his public recantation:

More particularly, I Renounce those disparaging and false Expressions, concerning the Rule of Faith, and the Use of it, in the Church of England. For whereas I then wrote, that the Canon of Scripture in the Church of England was no other, but what her own Members were pleased to allow; that the Private Spirit was the Support of the Protestant Faith; and that I my self, whilst in that Church, might have Choice of an hundred Faiths in Her. I am now fully convinced, That the Church of England does receive the very same Canon of Scripture, and the same Creeds, which have in all Ages of the Church been most Universally received, as containing all things Necessary to Salvation: And that She has due recourse to the Ancient Fathers, and the Authority of the Church; as the most effectual means for repressing the Extravagancies of each Man's private Spirit, and for the maintaining of Truth, and Peace, and good Order in the Church.²

Dryden followed a similar line of argument in *Religio Laici*, where he condemned the fruits of the private spirit in the sects. His conclusion was that "waiving each extreme" we should "learn what unsuspected ancients say," follow the Scripture and the Fathers and the tradition of the whole church, trying all by the light of reason.

And after hearing what our Church can say,
If still our reason runs another way,
That private reason 'tis more just to curb,
Than by disputes the public peace disturb.
For points obscure are of small use to learn:
But common quiet is mankind's concern.³

¹ *The Papers That passed between the Commissioners Appointed by his Majesty for the Alteration of the Common Prayer In An Account of all the Proceedings of the Commissioners for the Review [sic] of the Book of Common Prayer, etc., London, 1661.*

² Anthony Horneck, *An Account of Mr. Edward Scater's Return To The Communion of the Church of England And Of the Publick Recantation he made at the Church of St. Mary Savoy, the 5th of May, 1689* (London, 1689), pp. 11-12. See also the anonymous pamphlet attributed to Edward Stillingfleet, *An Answer to Some Papers Lately Printed, concerning the Authority of the Catholick Church In Matters of Faith, and the Reformation of the Church of England* (London, 1686), pp. 8-9. This pamphlet was published in reply to some recently circulated papers attributed to the late king, Charles II, and the first Duchess of York, deceased wife of James II, in support of the Roman Catholic church. Stillingfleet protests against the assumption that those of the Church of England "do leave every man to believe according to his own fancy. . . . For our Church receives the three Creeds, and embraces the four General Councils, and professes to hold nothing contrary to any Universal Tradition of the Church from the Apostles times."

³ Of course this doctrine of general consent with its opposition to the free exercise of the private judgment in matters religious was not accepted by all. My contention is merely that this doctrine, which strangely parallels the neo-Classical concept of literature, was strongly advanced and was accepted by representative English churchmen.

Just as politics and religion tended to fall together, so also religion and manners had close connection in the seventeenth century. The dissenters usually came from the middle and lower classes, which were often deficient in polite manners even if they were not marked by the eccentric habits of the Quaker or the Hebraic diction of the independent. Much of the sharpest satire in *Hudibras* deals with manners in social intercourse; it attacks fanaticism, enthusiasm, social singularity, and obstinate refusal to accord with custom. Such comic writers as Tom Brown and Ned Ward seem to regard as axiomatic the proposition that there is no gentleman but a churchman. In his character of "The Rude Man" Butler says: "He has neither Doctrine nor Discipline in him, like a fanatic Church, but is guided by the very same Spirit, that dipped the Herd of Swine in the Sea."¹

One important purpose of the seventeenth-century character writers was to recommend social conformity by ridiculing eccentricity. After the Restoration there was special need to reform the social ideals damaged in the preceding two decades, when individualism had run riot, untempered by the general sense. But the restrictive forces after 1660 were not new; they were merely more pronounced. Earlier in the century, Earle and Overbury and Hall had thrown their influence on the side of moderation and decorum. The social ideals recommended by these men and by Butler were not identical, but they were in a direct line of development.²

Butler's character of "The Over-Doer"³ is an example of the man who does not observe moderation, and in consequence is always wrong. Even more explicit is the statement in his Notebook: "... for Those that Use *Excess* in any Thing never understand the Truth of it, which always lies in the *Mean*."⁴ In conformity with this belief in measure, Butler satirized "The Affected or Formal," who carries to excess a belief in rules and formality.⁵ But, on the other hand, he did not recommend wanton violation of established custom:

In the Alphabet no letter has any Naturall Right to stand before another, but U might as well have taken place of all the Rest as A. But Custom has

¹ *Characters and Passages from Note-Books* (ed. A. R. Waller), p. 144.

² Because of his opposition to Rymer and the extreme principles of Aristotelian formalism, Butler has sometimes been considered romantic—or, at any rate, partly romantic—in criticism. Such a view is based upon the assumption that opposition to the extreme adherents of the school of rules indicates opposition to the fundamentals of neo-Classicism—a view that would rank Boileau himself with the romantic party.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 179.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 273.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 184.

Characters

been pleas'd to order it otherwise; and if wee should go about to alter that ranke: *the Reformation would be as troublesome as ridiculous.*¹

Butler's attitude in this respect was characteristic of the age. Measure and decorum was set up as social ideals:

But now our true and noble-spirited Gentleman is one that hath taken order with himself and sets a rule to all his pleasures and delights; not too precise or too lavish, but keeps a just medium and decorum in everything.²

The principles thus dominant in state, church, and society were also dominant in the literature of the time. Conditions in all these departments of thought were strikingly similar.³ As a result of Renaissance extravagance and the undisciplined individualism of the first part of the seventeenth century, English literature needed restriction, reform; it needed purging of excess and return to the normal, the healthy, the sane. It needed order, decorum, measure, respect for the general sense, precisely as England everywhere needed these same qualities. In the effort to attain them, it appealed to authority and tradition on the one hand and to reason and expediency on the other, precisely as the same appeals were made elsewhere. The resultant movement in literature we call "neo-Classicism"; but in constitutional, ecclesiastical, or social history we call it "good sense," "conservatism," "moderation," the "British national temper," or the "spirit of the age."

The relation of these ideals to Jonsonian classicism is evident. They represent the old principles developed logically and affected by the events of the intervening years. The chief addition is in the

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 407.

² Sam Vincent, *The Young Gallant's Academy, or, Directions how he should behave himself in all Places and Company*. . . . To which is added *The Character of a Town-Huff. Together with The Character of a right Generous and well-bred Gentleman*, London, 1674. The quotation is from the last of the appended characters, which bears in the body of the book the following title: *The Character of A Trus, Noble, Liberal, and Stayed Gentleman*. See also *The Country Gentleman's Vade Mecum.*, p. 136.

³ This similarity was more than once observed and commented upon at this time. Thus Butler characterizes "A Small Poet" (*Characters*, etc., p. 49): "He is always repealing the old Laws of Comedy, and like the long Parliament making Ordinances in their Stead; although they are perpetually thrown out of Coffee-Houses, and come to Nothing." Just as Butler here compares the undisciplined poet to the factious parliamentarian, so Dryden in the Prologue to *Ædipus* draws a parallel between the contemners of tradition in church and poetry:

With some respect to ancient wit proceed;
You take the first four councils for your creed.
But, when you lay tradition wholly by,
And on the private spirit alone rely,
You turn fanatics in your poetry.

increased respect paid the general sense and in the corresponding discredit of Renaissance individualism, in so far as the latter tended toward singularity. Jonson's respect for authority, for reason, and for measure had been extending their influence over the land. And when there was added to these the one classical quality in which Jonson had been most deficient, the way was made ready for the literature of the new age.

Now I do not assert that there was nothing of French influence in all this. France and England were both sharers in a movement that affected all Europe; and France had preceded England in its development. My contention is that obviously native institutions such as church and state, which differed fundamentally from the Gallic, manifested ideals strikingly like those shown in the literature of the time. So far as social ideals are concerned, the matter is less obvious; but these agree so well with the political and religious ideals and are so consonant with them that any foreign influence need not be insisted upon even here. If, then, the ideals that we have been noticing are in conformity with the national temper and are normal developments of the times, it is right to call them native elements in English neo-Classicism.

PAUL SPENCER WOOD

GRINNELL COLLEGE

CONCERNING THE "ODE ON A GRECIAN URN"

In her admirably fresh and thorough *John Keats*, Miss Amy Lowell writes:

The third, and final, stanza of the *Ode on Melancholy* is an almost angry denial of the attitude taken in stanzas three and five of the *Grecian Urn*. This positive answer to the stand taken in these stanzas of the *Grecian Urn* seems so evidently intentional that it is largely upon it that I base my belief in the priority of that poem.¹

The last stanza of the "Ode on Melancholy" asserts that Melancholy dwells, not with gloomy and ugly things, but with Beauty; the lines referred to in the "Grecian Urn" sing the happy lot of sculptured trees and lovers in that they are changeless, and of the urn itself which continues to bring its message of beauty to the short-lived generations of men.

The contradiction between the two passages seems to me apparent, not real. In each, beauty is associated with sadness and with either immortality or its opposite, mortality. ~~The difference is that what is implied in one poem is explicit in the other; that the grim chords of which we are but vaguely conscious in the one crash out unmistakably in the other.~~ For the "Ode on a Grecian Urn" deals not only with the immortality but the mortality of beauty. Immortal beauty is the main theme, but the wistful tone of the piece comes from the poet's acute consciousness that the loveliness of most living things and of many which are not alive—sunsets, rainbows, water-falls, and winds on the heath—is soon gone. As he looks at the urn he is troubled by two conflicting emotions:² joy in the presence of eternal beauty and

¹ II, 245.

² He has Moneta say to him in "The Fall of Hyperion" (I, 168-70):

"Thou art a dreaming thing

What bias, even in hope, is there for thee?

Every sole man hath days of joy and pain

The pain alone, the joy alone, distinct:

Only the dreamer venoms all his days,

Bearing more woe than all his sins deserve."

pain in the thought that the living things represented are "creatures of an hour." When he sighs,

Ah, happy, happy boughs! that cannot shed
Your leaves, nor ever bid the Spring adieu,

he is thinking of the living boughs that shed their leaves and die, and when he exclaims,

More happy love! more happy, happy love!
For ever warm and still to be enjoyed,
For ever panting, and for ever young,

he has in mind the human love that soon cools and grows old.

The contrast is made more explicit in the "Ode to a Nightingale," which speaks of the "immortal bird's" happy ignorance of our world

Where youth grows pale, and spectre-thin, and dies . . .
Where Beauty cannot keep her lustrous eyes,
Or new Love pine at them beyond to-morrow.

In this ode, the ephemeral nature of human beauty, love, and youth is contrasted with the immortality, not of art (as in the "Grecian Urn"), but of nature, symbolized by the nightingale:

Thou wast not born for death, immortal Bird!
No hungry generations tread thee down;
The voice I hear this passing night was heard
In ancient days by emperor and clown.

These two odes, then, picture the joy of contemplating eternal, apparently changeless beauty and the sorrow arising from the consciousness that much of the beauty which is dearest to man is, like all human joy, short lived. It is this sorrow that becomes the theme of the "Ode on Melancholy":

She dwells with Beauty—Beauty that must die;
And Joy, whose hand is ever at his lips
Bidding adieu; and aching Pleasure nigh.

We have here only a more explicit statement of one of the ideas of the other odes, although the idea is carried farther in the assertion that the deepest grief is to be derived from beauty and joy. Keats seems to argue that, as the chief means of escaping sadness (which are beauty and joy) themselves give rise to sadness, hence

In the very temple of Delight
Veil'd Melancholy has her sovran shrine.

A mote it is to trouble the mind's eye that in the "Grecian Urn" the beauties of nature are spoken of as transitory, ~~while in the "Nightingale" they are regarded as eternal. The reasoning in the latter poem will not bear close scrutiny.~~ The apparent changelessness of nature is only apparent, for the individual tree, flower, and bird dies; no mountain or valley, indeed no scene (except an unbroken expanse of water), remains throughout the ages just as it was; and we cannot be sure that the nightingale's song which we hear is the same as that heard "in ancient days by emperor and clown." Nor is it logical to contrast an individual with a species: the individual man is mortal, so is the individual bird; the nightingale species lives on but so does the race of men.² Yet this is an inconsistency to which, in self-conscious and less heroic moods, we are all prone. Byron voiced something similar to it when he said of Greece:

Yet are thy skies as blue, thy crags as wild;
Sweet are thy groves, and verdant are thy fields,
Thine olive ripe as when Minerva smiled . . .
Art, Glory, Freedom, fail, but Nature still is fair.³

The egotism which led the chieftains of old to have their wives, slaves, horses, and other possessions sacrificed at their funeral pyres lingers with us all. Deep within us we cherish, unconsciously, a vague resentment against the world for not dying with us. The persistence of the race does not satisfy us, and we ignore the passing of individual flowers and birds. It was so with Keats.

The most famous assertion of the immortality of beauty is not, however, in the odes but in *Endymion*:

A thing of beauty is a joy for ever.

It would seem as if here were the idea expressed in the "Grecian Urn," but a careful reading of the passage which follows shows that Keats

¹ Miss Lowell (II, 252) is high handed with Mr. Bridges and others on this point and, as it seems to me, without cause.

² Keats is not taking into account the future life or he might have written,

"I was not born for death, O mortal Bird
No hungry generations tread me down."

³ *Childe Harold*, II, 319-27.

is here using the word "immortal" loosely and that he has in mind, not the persistence of an object, but the constant delight we derive from it, or from the memory of it:

Nor do we merely feel these essences
For one short hour; no

. . . . the moon,
The passion poesy, glories infinite,
Haunt us till they become a cheering light
Unto our souls, and bound to us so fast,
That, whether there be shine, or gloom o'ercast,
They always must be with us, or we die.¹

Miss Lowell says: "Irony and pain are in these lines:

'Or if thy mistress some rich anger shows,
Emprison her soft hand, and let her rave,
And feed deep, deep upon her peerless eyes.'

* (Such behavior could only be possible to the shallow and disillusioned, as Keats knew right well. Such counsel to himself was the height of sarcasm, rending the heart from which it sprang."² But may not Keats have meant the lines in a less personal sense? He writes, "When the melancholy fit shall fall/ . . . glut thy sorrow on a morning rose,/ Or on the rainbow . . . /Or on . . . peonies;/Or"—and then follows the passage given above. Did he not intend to say, "Or on the beauty of women"? That is, "Feel the softness of your sweetheart's hand and gaze into the splendor of her eyes when anger has brought them to their greatest brilliance; and, as the fire dies out of them with the change of mood, realize how quickly she and her loveliness must pass away, how our deepest sorrows come from our deepest joys and from the most beautiful objects." Keats did not counsel indifference to the beloved one's sufferings but directed our attention, for the moment, to the effect of anger on her beauty, an effect which suited his purpose better because it is so transitory.

The "Grecian Urn" closes with the familiar lines:

Thou shalt remain, in midst of other woe
Than ours, a friend to man, to whom thou say'st,
"Beauty is truth, truth beauty,"—that is all
Ye know on earth, and all ye need to know.

¹ *Endymion*, I, 25-33; cf. "Tintern Abbey," II, 22-57, and the last stanza of "The Daffodils" and of "The Solitary Reaper."

² II, 245.

The manuscript and the first printed version of the poem have no quotation marks in the penultimate line which, in the first printed version, appears thus:

Beauty is Truth, Truth Beauty.—That is all. . . .

This punctuation seems to Buxton Forman "to confirm the limitation of the Urn's moral to the five words indicated in the text." "I find them," he writes of the "pointing and capitalling" of this version, "very characteristic of Keats, and suggestive of accurate printing from a fair manuscript of his. But for this I should have been disposed to regard the words

that is all

Ye know on earth, and all ye need to know

as a part of the Urn's lesson, and not as the poet's personal comment."¹ But to have the comment of the poet follow, without any explanation, immediately after that of the vase is so awkward and unnatural that few persons seem to have understood the lines in this way. And surely if Keats had been speaking in his own person, he would not have augmented this awkwardness and obscurity by writing "ye" in the last line; he would have said, "That is all *we* know." All these difficulties vanish if we follow the manuscript and the first printed version (the punctuation of the latter by no means compels us to assume a new speaker for the last line and a third)² and regard all of the two closing lines as the utterance of the urn. As to the quotation marks, if they are Keats's own and not a mistake they may have been intended to indicate, not the words of the urn, but an apothem, the kind of thing that is usually quoted. That is, they may mean: "The maxim, 'Beauty is truth, truth beauty,' contains all you know or need to know."

Quite apart, however, from the question as to who utters them, the last line and a third of the ode have long puzzled me. Beauty and truth are, in the larger and nobler meaning of those terms, very closely akin. This we know, but in what sense is it all we know or all we need to know? An answer to these queries came to me last summer as I

¹ *The Complete Works of Keats* (New York, n.d.), II, 105 n.

² Similar punctuation and capitalization are used in the last line of the "Ode to a Nightingale" where there is only a slight break in the thought,

"Fled is that music:—Do I wake or sleep?"

stood looking at the Roman aqueduct at Tarragona which, after so many centuries, still lifts its simple tawny arches against the pale-blue sky. The men who laid these stones, I thought, and the many generations who followed them were in the main absorbed in gaining money, position, and pleasure; they gave their time to politics, to ambition, to love, and to the petty affairs of the neighborhood. All these are gone; yet this simple, useful work, so honest, so strongly built, so satisfying to the eye, abides. It often seems as if only such things, having the beauty of truth and the truth of beauty, really count. They are all we achieve on earth that is worth while and all we need to concern ourselves with—all we know and all we need to know. Was it something like this that Keats had in mind?

RAYMOND D. HAVENS

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

SOME REVISED ETYMOLOGIES

1. OE *batt*, "club, stick," NE *bat*, may be a genuine Ger. word with *-tt-* from pre-Ger. *-ty-*: OE *beado*, "battle, war," "OHG *batu-* in compounds, Russ. *batovat'*, "das Getreide ausdreschen," *batŭ*, "Eichenstock," Serb.-Cr. *bŭtati*, "schlagen, klopfen," etc. (cf. Berneker, I, 46), ON *baðmr*, "tree; branch of a tree."

2. OE *buter-*, *buttor-flēoge*, "butterfly," probably has nothing to do with *butter* but means rather "bottle-fly": OE *butruc*, "leather bottle," with which compare OE *bytt*, "wine-skin; cask," *butruc* (big) "end; piece of land," NE *buttock*, *butt*, LG *butt*, "stumpf, plump; kurzes, dickes Kind," *butte*, "plattleibiger stumpfköpfiger Fisch," etc. For meaning compare NE *bluebottle*, "a dipterous insect with a blue abdomen."

3. Late OE *curs*, "curse," *cursian*, "pronounce a curse on," are, so far as I know, unexplained. They are evidently ecclesiastical in origin, *curs* being the Lat. *cursus*, used of a set of prayers. So in the Mainzer Beichte we find: *mīnan curs ne irvulla so ih solda*; in the Pfälzer Beichte: *mīnan curs ni givulla*, etc., where *curs irvullen* (*givullen*) corresponds to the Lat. *cursum suum adimplere* (*Denkm. LXXIV*, 11 and n.), *curs* (*cursus*), meaning "Reihe vorgeschriebener Gebete" (Lexer, *Mhd. Wb.*, 1794). In OE *curs* usage restricted the word to the series of imprecatory prayers of excommunication, with later extension to all kinds of imprecations. In the development of meaning it is not unlike *ban*, which at first meant "proclamation, command"; or *imprecate*, which in Latin can be used of blessings as well as curses.

4. Goth. *gairrus*, "sanft, freundlich," ON *kvirr*, *kyrr*, "quiet, still, calm, at rest," *kyrra*, "calm, still," *kyrra*, "calmness; calm weather," MHG *kürre*, *kirre*, "zahn, milde," are well combined with Lett. *gurstu*, *gurt*, "matt, kraftlos werden, kinwelken," *gursāt*, "müde machen," Lith. *gurstu*, *gurt*, "sich legen vom Winde" (cf. Fick, III⁴, 62), from a base *g^{er}-*, which may also be in Lith. *gėras* (milde), "gut," *gėrinti*, "gut machen, bessern," *gėrybė*, "die Güte, etwas Gutes," *geriūtis*, "sich beruhigen von Zornwütigen" (cf. Hirt, *PBB*, XXIII,

252). To these we may also add Gr. ἡλλέ-βορος, "hellebore," from *ἡλλερό-βορος, a compound of ἡλλερος· κακός (cf. Prellwitz², p. 139), meaning "mollifying or curing ills," not as explained by Prellwitz, *loc. cit.* Compare also Lat. *vērātrum*, "hellebore," which may be from *g^hērā-tro-m, "pacifier, mollifier." The ancient explanation of this word as well as the modern modification as given in Walde *s.v.* are too fanciful to be taken seriously. And yet the word may belong to *vērus*, not in the sense "true" but in that preserved in *sevērus*, "ungentle, stern, severe," *vērus*, "right, proper, reasonable, just," ON *værr*, "freundlich, ruhig, angenehm," Goth. *unwērei*, "Unwille," OHG *miti-wāri*, "sanftmütig." So in either case *vērātrum* would mean as defined above and agree with the corresponding Greek word and with OE *wēde-beorge* (madness-curer), "hellebore."

The primary meaning of this base must have been "sink, subside, droop," whence naturally the meanings as in the words above: "[be- come] quiet, calm, gentle, mild, good; weak, feeble, etc.," and "heavy, slow," as below.

5. Goth. *kaurus*, "βαρύς, heavy," *kaurei*, "βάρος, weight," *kaurjan*, "βαρεῖν, βαρύνειν, oppress," Skt. *gurūh*, "heavy, weighty, important," Gr. *βαρύς*, "heavy," Lat. *gravis*, etc., to which belong Gr. *βρδῶμος*, "stink, smell, esp. of beasts at rut," *βρωμάομαι, βρωμέω*, "smell rank, stink," *βρωμολόγος*, "foul-mouthed," *βρωμώδης*, "foul-smelling": *βαρύς*, "strong, offensive, of smell," *βαρυ-ᾄής*, "strong-smelling" (Nic. Th. 43), *βαρύ-πνοος*, "strong-smelling," *βαρύ-οῖος, -οδμος, -οσμος*, "of oppressive smell," *βαρυοδμία*, "oppressiveness of smell," Lat. *gravis*, "of smell or flavor, strong, unpleasant, offensive, bitter," *gravitas*, "of smell, rankness, offensiveness, fetidness," *graveolens*, "strong-smelling, ill-smelling, noisome, rank," *graveolentia*, "an offensive or rank smell, fetidness" (*alarum, oris, narium*); Gr. *βραδύς*, "slow; tardy," Lat. *gurdus*, "lentus, inutilis": Gr. *βαρύς*, "heavy, slow" (*βάσις*), *βαρύ-γουνος*, "heavy-kneed, lazy," etc.: Gr. *βρέφος* (*g^hre-bhos, "weight"), "babe in the womb, fetus; new-born child, young of animal, foal, whelp, cub," etc.: *βαρύνεσθαι τὴν γαστέρα*, "be pregnant," Lat. *gravis*, "heavy; heavy with child, pregnant," *gravidus*, "with child, with young, pregnant," *gravitas*, "weight; pregnancy, fetus," *gravesco*, "become heavy; become pregnant," *gravēdo*, "heaviness of the limbs; pregnancy."

From "sink" come also words for "depth, abyss, chasm; gullet, throat," whence "swallow, devour, eat, drink," and finally "food, meat, bait": Gr. βάραθρον, "pit, gulf; ruin, perdition," Lat. *gurgēs*, *vorāgo*, *vorāre*, Gr. βιβρώσκω, "devour, eat up," βορός, "gluttonous," βορά, "meat," βρώμα, "food," OHG *querdar*, "Köder," etc.

6. NE *by hook or (by) crook* is explained in the Century Dictionary by a reference to Bartlett (*Fam. Quot.*, 637) in a way that might be plausible if both *hook* and *crook* were not used of a tricky action from the earliest times down. The natural interpretation is the correct one: that the phrase means "by trick or fraud," not simply "by one means or another." Because *hook* can mean "a sickle" is no reason that it is so used in this expression. For *hook* in the sense of "trick" compare OE *hinder-hōc*, "stratagem."

7. ON *heðinn*, "Pelzrock," OE *heðen*, "dress," OHG *-hetan* as in *Wolf-hetan* are referred in Fick III⁴, 90, to a Ger. **hidana-*, which is supposed to be an early derivative of Gr. Ion. κίθων. They are rather from Ger. **hedana-*, "pelt, fur": ON *haðna*, "kid, young goat," MHG *hatele*, "goat," with which compare also MHG *hāz*, *hæze*, "Rock, Kleid, Kleidung," OE *hæteru* (-t- for -tt-), "clothes," and *hættian*, "scalp [as punishment]," Skt. *çāta-h*, "Ausfall [der Haare, etc.]," *çātanaḥ*, "abschlagend, fällend, vernichtend," *çātin-*, "abhauend," *çātáyati*, -tē, "zerschneidet, zerteilt, haut ab, bricht ab, löst ab, wirft nieder, vernichtet," base **ket-*, "cut, strip off," whence words for "skin, pelt" and "stript or fleeced animals, τὰ λεπτὰ τῶν προβάτων." For meaning compare Gr. *πέκω*, "strip, pull off, clip, shear," *πόκος*, "fleece," ON *fær*, "sheep"; OBulg. *koza*, "goat," *koža*, "skin, pelt," Goth. *hakuls*, "cloak."

8. OE *niht-scada*, "nightshade, solanum," OHG *naht-scato*, "Nachtschatten," etc., have a Ger. stem **skadan-*, which is supposed to be related to *shade*. It meant rather "hurting, injuring": OE *scapa*, "injury; one who does injury or harm, criminal, thief," *scapian*, "do mischief; steal," Goth. *skapjan*, "injure, damage," OHG *scadōn*, "schaden," *scado*, "Schaden; Schädiger," etc. The stem **skadan-*, "damager; thief," is also in NHG *nachtschatten*, -schade, "Nachtschwalbe" (Adelung), Dan. *natskade*, "Nachtrabe." This is from a base **skhēth-*, with ablaut -ō-, -ə-: Gr. ἀσκηθής, "unhurt, unharmed," Ir. *scathaim*, "mutilate," from **skhē-*, "cut, strip": Skt. *chātah*,

childh, "abgeschnitten," *chydī*, "schneidet ab," Gr. *σχάω*, *σχάζω*, "slit, open," *σχίζω*, "split, cleave," etc. For other related words see *Modern Philology*, XVIII, 86, 92, 304.

It is possible that the first element of *nightshade* is not *night*, but a Ger. **nahla-*, "noxious plant, solanum," pre-Ger. **nokto-*, "noxious," Skt. *naṣṭā-*, "verloren gegangen," *naçyati*, "geht verloren, vergeht," Lat. *nox*, *necāre*, *noceo*, *noxius*, etc. The compound would then be like NHG *lindwurm*, with the second part added when the first word was obscure in meaning.

9. OE *ælf-bone*, "nightshade," must have received its name similarly. The second part may be from **pagne*: OE *of-peggan*, "destroy," ON *þægja*, "drücken," Ir. *tachtaim*, "ersticke," Welsh *tagu*, "strangulare." Compare the development in meaning of Gr. *σπύγχος*, Lat. *sōlānum*, "nightshade" (*Phil. Quar.*, II, 262, 266).

10. OE *þung*, "aconite, poisonous plant, [vegetable] poison," MLG *wōden-dunk*, *-dungal*, "aconite," also *wēden-dunk*, *wē-dungele* (probably from **wēde-dungele*: *wēde-wesle*, "cicuta"), no doubt received the name from the narcotic effect of the plant. Compare ON *þungr*, "heavy [also of a feeling of heaviness in the head]; difficult," *þungi*, "heaviness, load, burden," with which have been combined ChSl *tegota*, "Bürde," *taga*, "Kummer" (Fick, III⁴, 180). Or the Ger. words may represent pre-Ger. **tungho-*: Av. *θwqz-*, "be distressed," OHG *dwingan*, "drücken, drängen, bedrängen," *thwang*, MHG *dwanc*, *twanc*, "Not, Bedrängniss, Ungemach," etc. The composition of the MLG word indicates the use of aconite as a fever remedy, as also in MLG *wōde-schere*, *-scherne*, "Schierling, cicuta, ebenus," MHG *wuot-scherlinc*, "Wutschierling, apiridium, cicuta," *wuotich*, "furor; cicuta," OE *wēde-beorge*, "hellebore."

11. OE *tōm*, "free from," ON *tómr*, "empty," *tóm*, "emptiness, vacuity, vacuum; leisure," *tæma*, "empty," Swed., Dan. *tom*, "empty," NE dial. *toom*, "empty," *teem* (ME *tēmen*, OE **tēman*), "empty; pour," OS *tōmi*, *tōmig*, "ledig," *tōmian*, "befreien, erledigen," OHG *zuomig*, "vacant, of a house" (no connection with *widar-zōmi*, *-zuomi*, "adversans, absurdus, asper, horridus": *wider-zāmi*, "der einem widerwärtig oder missfällig ist," *widerzemen*, "widerstrebend sein; zuwider sein, missfallen," *zeman*, "ziemen") represent a Ger. stem **tōma-* or **tōmu-*, which I refer to the root **dā-* in Skt. *dāti*, "schneidet

ab, trennt, teilt," *ava-dāta-h*, "rein, klar," etc. (IE *a**, etc., 67), and may therefore be compared with Gr. *δῆμος*, Dor. *ḍāmos*, "division, district, country, land") (on which cf. Boisacq s.v.).

12. NE dial. *temse*, "sieve, bolter, strainer," ME *temse*, OE **temes*, *temesian*, *temsian*, "sift," MLG *tem(e)s*, "Sieb, Haarsieb, Sichtbeutel," *tem(e)sen*, "durchsichten, durchsehen," MDu *teems*, *temes*, "sieve," *teemsen*, "sift," OHG *zemissa*, "bran," are closely related to the foregoing from the ablaut-form **dām-*, "separate, sift." For the meaning compare Gr. *κρίνω*, "separate, put apart; determine, judge," Lat. *cerno*, "separate, sift; distinguish, discern," *cribrum*, "sieve," *cribo*, "sift," Goth. *hrains*, "rein," OE *hrīdder*, *hriddel*, "large sieve, riddle," *hrīdrian*, "sift."

13. Goth. *taihun*, "decem," IE **dekm̥*, Skt. *dāṣa*, etc., are best explained by referring the original word for "ten" to the base **dekm̥* in the sense "row, series" (of fingers): MLG *teche*, *techge*, MHG *zeche*, "Anordnung, Reihenfolge, Zunft," *zechen*, "anordnen, schaffen, veranstalten; zechen," OE *tiohhian*, "arrange; determine, consider," *teohh* (line, row), "race, generation; troop, body of men," **teh-w-*, Goth. *tēwa*, "Ordnung," **tēgwō*, OBulg. *desiti*, "finden," Serb.-Cr. *dēsiti*, "treffen," *ǎ-dēsiti*, "richten, zurechtmachen; treffen," *ǎ-desan*, "in Ordnung, richtig," etc. (cf. Fick III⁴, 153), MLG *tachchen* (Ger. *-hh-*, *-hw-*, pre-Ger. **kw-*), "bestimmen, einrichten, gestalten."

The meaning "arrange, set in order" probably came from "stretch out, extend." From this naturally comes "reach, get, take, reichen, erreichen" and "extend, darreichen." From "extend, project" come words for "stick, beam," as in the following.

14. Norw. dial. *tagg*, *tagge*, "hervorragende Spitze, Zacke" (with *-gg-* from Ger. *-gw-*), MLG *tagge*, *tacke* (*-kk-* from pre-Ger. *-kw-*), "Ast, Zweig, Zacke," MHG *zacke*, ME *takke*, "tack": Gr. *δοκός*, "a beam, esp. in the roof or floor of a house; the bar of a gate or door," *δοκίς*, "a small beam, stick, rod."

15. Goth. *tēkan*, pret. *taitōk*, "touch, ἅπτειναι," may have *-k-* from pre-Ger. *-kw-* or *-kn-*, which would also explain the *-kk-* in MLG *tacken*, "berühren, betasten," and *-k-* in MDu *tāken*, "nehmen, packen, kriegen," ON *fá-tǫkr* (taking little), "poor, pauper," *tók*, "took," *taka* (with *-k-* by analogy), "lay hold of, take, seize," base **dekm̥-* (or *dēkn-*), "reach out: take; offer"; Skt. *dāṣvān*, "Opfer darbringend, verehrend,

fromm," *dācati*, *dācnōti*, "bringt Opfer dar, erweist Verehrung, gewährt, verleiht," MLG *tachchen*, "einrichten, bestimmen, gestalten," MDu *taggen*, "plagen, zerren, reizen," etc., as above.

16. OE *tōh*, "tough; glutinous," OHG *zāhi*, MHG *zæhe*, "was sich langsam ausdehnt, ziehen lässt, geschmeidig ist, zähe, tenax, klebrig," Ger. **tanhu-*, "ductilis, tenax," and **tēgu-* in Norw. *taag*, "langsam, andauernd," Efris. *tage*, "dehnbar, biegsam, zähe, dauerhaft, haltbar," MLG *tēge*, "zähe" (Fick III⁴, 152), or *tage*, *tēge* from OLG **lāhi*, equivalent to OHG *zāhi*. With these compare OHG *zag*, "zaghaft, furchtsam, unentschlossen," *zagēn*, "verzagt sein" (cf. Schade, 1224), with which may be combined OE *taccian*, "tame," NE *tacky*, "sticky, adhesive, tenacious" (of surfaces or substances), also used locally in the United States meaning "ungroomed, unkempt," subst. "an ill-fed or neglected horse, a rough, bony nag," pre-Ger. **do(n)k-*, **dēk-*, "tenax." For the foregoing meanings compare Lat. *tenax*, "holding fast, tenacious, tough; grasping, niggardly, stingy [MHG *zæhe*, "was sich anhängt, geizig"]; that holds or sticks fast, that clings together, matted, sticky, viscid [*tough*, *tacky*]; holding back, stubborn, obstinate" (OHG *zag*, "sich vorsichtig von etwas fernhaltend, zurückhaltend, zaghaft"): Gr. Ion., *δέκομαι*, "take, receive," etc.

17. OE *wergulŷ*, "crab apple," is probably for **wyrgeļu*, in any case related to MHG *würgel*, MLG *worgel*, "Würger," *worgelinge*, "das Zusammenziehen des Schlundes; Herbigkeit [von Speisen]," *worgelik*, *worgelhaftich*, "zusammenziehend, herbe [von Geschmack]," *worgen*, "würgen, mühevoll schlucken; erwürgen, erdrosseln," MHG *würgen*, OE *wyrġan*, "strangle," etc. The crab apple is here named from the puckery effect produced by eating it, just as *crab apple* means properly "astringent or sour apple."

18. Goth. *kunawida*, *ἄλυσ*, Fessel," OHG *khuna-uwiþi*, "catenae" (Gl. I, 204, 32. 38), *cuonio-widi*, "fetters" (Merseb. 1), have in the first part a Ger. **kuna-*, **kunja-* (not **kūna-* as indicated by Braune, *Ahd. Lb.*, vocabulary), meaning "limb," pre-Ger. **gun(i)o-*, from the base **geu-*, "bend, curve," whence Gr. *γῦιον*, "limb," *γυιοπέδη*, "a fether," *γυιό-κολλος*, "binding the limbs," *γυιοῦχος*, "fettering the limbs," etc. The Ger. compound is made up like Gr. *γυιοπέδη*. The second part: Goth. *-wida*, OHG *wiþi*, is related to the group of words represented by NE *withe*, NHG *weide*.

FRANCIS A. WOOD

REVIEWS

An Italian Dictionary. By ALFRED HOARE. Second Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1925. Pp. xxxii+906. \$14.00.

For ten years Mr. Hoare's has been unquestionably the best of our Italian-English dictionaries. Now that the second edition has appeared, with many corrections and additions, and with the English-Italian part "entirely rewritten," still more emphatically do we welcome this work and eagerly recommend it to all our colleagues and students. Incidentally, let us note that in appearance this quarto volume is as handsome as ever, that the paper and the printing are excellent. The price is high, to be sure. We hope that a cheaper edition for students will soon be issued.

Obviously the compilation of a dictionary is a very large and difficult task. It requires in the lexicographer a solid basis of linguistic scholarship, utterly bilingual familiarity, and a breadth of general knowledge which must be, as Mr. Hoare once said, practically encyclopedic. Furthermore, the dealer in words and in the varied, tenuous shadings of words must be more than a linguistic scientist; he must be, by intuition at least, a poet, for even in a work like this one, which consists largely of compilation, he constantly has to solve problems that call for very subtle, even imaginative, personal discernment. Even a dictionary may be a work of art. From all these different angles we find that Mr. Hoare brought to this task a very rich equipment indeed.

It is very unfortunate that in reviewing such a work it is manifestly impossible to point out its innumerable points of excellence, while it is possible to enumerate the few points at which one might take issue with the author. But since our common, ultimate goal is truth, and accuracy of knowledge, and since Mr. Hoare would be the very first to desire, rather than resent, criticism, we offer here a few comments. We shall place them under the following heads: "I. Introduction"; "II. Italian-English Part": "(1) Arrangement," "(2) Word Forms," "(3) Translations," "(4) Definitions," "(5) Idioms," "(6) Etymologies," "(7) Omissions," "(8) Typographical Errors"; "III. English-Italian Part."

I. INTRODUCTION

Three important additions have been made in this second edition: (1) a brief but comprehensive article by Professor Grandgent "On the Development of the Italian Language"; (2) an elaborate exposition of the conjugation of Italian verbs, with a complete list of "strong, irregular, defective and other difficult verbs . . . with hints as to their conjugation"; (3) a "List of the

Principal Verbs and Adjectives which may be followed by an infinitive, showing what preposition, if any, is to be used, corresponding to the English 'to.' These additions will prove invaluable, especially to the student, who, we venture to say, will not find such adequate treatment of these important subjects in any current grammar.

In the list of verbs, however, we find, under *dolere*, *dolghiamo* or *dogliamo*. Giving the two forms together seems to imply that they are interchangeable or should be selected in that order. Both these implications are, however, incorrect, because *dogliamo* is decidedly the good form, while the other is used very rarely indeed, if ever. *Pensare*, in the same list, is given as requiring the preposition *a*. It certainly does, usually, but may take *di* when the sense implied is not that of "thinking of," but of "having an opinion about" (cf. French). *Penso a te*, "I am thinking of you," but *Cosa pensi di lui?* "What do you think of him?" It might be well in the body of the book, if not here, to call attention to the fact that this verb does not take the accusative but the dative, and that it requires *a* with the disjunctive pronoun. It is incorrect to say *ti penso*, and yet we occasionally find it, as, for instance, in Fogazzaro's *Quiete meridiana sull'Alpe*:

Penso un lontano
Core che pensami,

where, in two lines, there are two errors, which should here be attributed to poetic license. The verb *recensire* does not appear in this list. In these days of universal and ubiquitous book-reviewing, this newcomer of ancient ancestry, now certainly in common, though literary usage, might well be included. Finally, in the list of reference books, we miss Meyer-Lübke's *Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg, 1911, and the *Archivio Glottologico Italiano*.

II. ITALIAN-ENGLISH PART

1. *Arrangement*.—The system which was so felicitously and practically devised by Mr. Hoare in his first edition, of using a larger type for "those words which will be most looked for, and the smaller type for the rest,"¹ is here continued. Of course such a scheme presents solutions which must, at times, be quite arbitrary. No two scholars will, therefore, always agree on the application of this arrangement, much as they may commend the scheme in general. Although Mr. Hoare explains further that among the smaller-type words he has included "all obsolete and local expressions and technical terms, words which are immediate derivatives of other words, . . . and also words which are practically identical in Italian and English," yet we do not see, for example, why words so abstruse as the following, to mention only a few, should have been placed in large type: *anemocordo*, *anfaneggiare*, *arrestabue*, *babbione*, *capannisondersi*, *ciangottare*, *contrimpannata*, *dulcamara*, *encaustica*, *faldistoro*, *farfanicchio*, *gabbacristiani*, *giusquiamo*, *lampredotto*, *maggiociondolo*,

¹ "Plan of the Work," p. ix.

mazzacchera, mondualdo, museragnolo, pancerone, pedocomio, pirocorvetta, slazzerare, sussecivo, terzarolare, unguella, vernereccio, and zonzonare. On the other hand, we fail to see why such common words as the following should have been placed in small type: *amore, essa, eviva, felice, garantire, guaio, mila, and umile*.

2. *Word forms*.—Under this heading should be included: (a) words which, being obsolete, should have been starred (in accordance with Mr. Hoare's practice); (b) words that appear in a spelling which is, at least, unusual; (c) words for which peculiar inflections are given, or which require some grammatical explanation.

a) The question whether certain words are obsolete or not is a particularly intricate one in Italian, because a word may well no longer be in current speech, and yet remain current in rhetorical prose and in contemporary poetry in a country where rhetorical speech is all too frequent and poetry in verbal imitation of old Italian standards is still profusely written. Yet we do feel that the following words can be said no longer to be current in Tuscan usage: *carcame* for *carcassa*, *corre* for *cogliere*, *marrano*, *messere* (though Cr.¹ says it may still be used in legal terminology, and Pian. adds that "oggi è quasi uscito d'uso e solo rimane in alcuni luoghi di Abruzzo come titolo di onore che le donne danno ai suoceri"), *monna, muda* (why does H. call it *scherz.*? The origin of a word for "jail" from "cage" might possibly seem *scherz.*, though natural, but surely there is nothing jocose, for instance, in Dante's use of the word: "Breve pertugio dentro dalla muda," *Inf.*, xxxiii, 22), *persica* for *pesca*, *possanza* for *potenza*, *sciorre* for *sciogliere* (in giving *sciogliere* or *sciorre* H. seems to imply that they are interchangeable, which they are not, the latter being archaic and poetic only).

b) There is hardly sufficient authority for the spelling *Ammen*, for *Amen*. The latter form should by all means have first place, if the former needs to be included at all (Cr.). In Tuscan vernacular *Amen* would naturally become *Amenne*, possibly even *Ammenne*, but the primary form remains *Amen*. *Arruffio* has an augmentative *arruffone*, but not *arruffione* (Cr., R. F.). Since *dota*, "pop. for *dote*," is omitted by Cr. and R. F. and merely mentioned as a possibility by P., it is a question whether it should be included or not. It may be accounted for by the fact that, in illiterate speech, words ending in a singular *e* are frequently drawn to a plural also in *e* by analogy with words in singular *a*, plural *e*. But such variants are today both illiterate and rare.

¹ When quoting dictionaries, the following abbreviations are used, inclosed in a parenthesis immediately following the word concerned: Cr. = *Vocabolario degli accademici della Crusca*, Firenze, 1863 ff.; P. = *Petrocchi, Novo dizionario universale della lingua italiana*, Milano, 1902; R. F. = *Rigutini e Fanfani, Vocabolario italiano della lingua parlata*, Firenze, 1891; T. B. = *Tommaseo-Bellini, Dizionario della lingua italiana*, Torino (1879); Pian. = *Pianigiani, Vocabolario etimologico della lingua italiana*, Roma-Milano, 1907; Z. = *Zambaldi, Vocabolario etimologico italiano*, Città di Castello, 1889; Cent. = *Century Dictionary*, New York (1890-91); Mur. = *New English Dictionary*, by James A. H. Murray, Oxford, 1888; Webs. = *Webster's International Dictionary*, Springfield, Mass., 1925; and, of course, H. for Hoare.

c) *Angariare*: it might be noted that *fare angherie* is better. The gender of *automobile* wavered from *m.* to *f.* for many years. The fact, however, that this word was first used as an adjective immediately following *vettura* (*f.*) has, we believe, finally swung it to the feminine (cf. French). *Meno* and *più* have a peculiarity worth mentioning: they take the article *lo* instead of the regular *il*, in the phrases *per lo più* and *per lo meno*, both very common.

3. *Translations*.—In the order, accuracy, and quantity of translations one may well differ from Mr. Hoare, and even at times from his model, Petrocchi, in certain interpretations. While some of the changes here proposed may be slight and pedantic, most of them have immediate reference to current Tuscan or literary usage and the needs of students. *Abituro* is often used, *scherz.* for "house" or "home": *il mio modesto abituro*, "my modest home." *Accaparrare* often signifies "to get hold of," as in *M'ha accaparrato per tutto il pomeriggio*, "He took hold of me for the whole afternoon" (cf. French). *Accoltellare*, add: "to knife" (Webs.) as in Kipling: "She knifed me one night. . . ." *Accoppiare* originally meant "to kill" (Cr.), but is popularly used for "to beat up," cf. French *taper dessus*. *Aire*, "*dare l'—*," to urge on," not so much as "to turn loose" (R. F.); *dagli l'aire*, "turn him [her] loose." *Albergo*, add: "abode," as in Tasso's *Aminta*:

Congiunti eran gli alberghi
Ma più congiunti i cori.

—Act I, scene ii.

Archetto, add: "slingshot"; *ardito*, add, since Mr. Hoare has made it a point to add military terms: plural "shock troops"; *arruffare*, add: "to dishevel," and *arruffone*, add: "bungler" (Cr., R. F.); *arte*, add: "craft." This word is very important, literarily, as in *Commedia dell'arte*, and is used commonly as in *Lui non è dell'arte*, "He is not an expert, not a professional, not of the craft." Likewise, for *artefice*, add: "craftsman." *Ascrivere*, add: "enrol" (Cr., P.). *Astio*, "envy, spite," rather: "animosity," which contains the other two. *Atavismo*, why not "atavism"? *Attaccare*, add: "to hitch up," in the sense of horses. *Attilato*, add: "tight fitting" (Cr.). *Avvisare*, add: "to notify." *Bagher* or *baghero* (which in Tuscan would become *baghere* or *bagherre*), "carriage," add: "a small, low, four-wheeled carriage for country use" (not in R. F., but see P.). *Bandita*, "2. Enclosed pasture ground," rather "private hunting ground" (Cr.). *Barcamenarsi*, "to get through somehow [implying discreditable means]"—the word means usually "to steer cleverly, to handle one's self adroitly, so as to make the best of a situation" (Cr., R. F.). *Barocco*, add: "flamboyant," which is the term used for florid architecture. *Becero*, "low blackguard, cad." The question here is whether "cad" implies vulgarity or not. It probably does in England, though with us "cad" seems to mean the exact opposite of "good sport," without connotations of vulgarity. *Becero* has connotations of low breeding and insolence, but not at all of rascality. *Bidello*, add: "usher," as the man who, in Italian university lec-

tures, ushers in the professor. *Bigoncia*, add: "tub in which grapes are first crushed to make wine"; hence, probably: "*essere in bigoncia*, to be in difficulties." *Birba*, "1. lazy young fellow, rascal." The word suggests mischief more than laziness (in spite of Cr. and R. F.). Similarly, *birichino* does not mean "impudent boy or girl," but merely "mischief" or "mischievous." *Che birichino!* "What a mischief!" *Bisbetica*—would it be superfluous to add that *La bisbetica domata* is the accepted translation of *The Taming of the Shrew*? *Bis*, "in provincial theaters, a call for the repetition of the piece on the following night." Rather long and inaccurate explanation for "encore" (Webs.). Similarly, *bissare*, "to encore" (Webs.). *Biscotto*, add: "fillip," and "B. Italianized form of boy scout" seems altogether too recent and too frivolous a contamination to be included at all. *Bolla*, add: "boil." *Bonifica* (omitted by Cr., while R. F. says: "dirai bonificamento")—we must here take the liberty of disagreeing even with the revered R. F., because *bonifica* is very often used for land improvements, as in: "Questi [Leopoldo II] ... continuò le bonifiche maremmane, ..." by Guido Biagi (who was certainly both a scholar and an excellent contemporary Tuscan writer) in his *Fiorenza fior che sempre rinnovella* (Firenze: Battistelli, 1925), page 314. *Boriarsi*, add: "to brag," because "swagger" suggests also walking (Webs.), which is not suggested by *boriarsi*. *Buscare*, add: *buscarne*, "to get the worst of it" or "to get a whipping," as e.g., *Bada, bambino, sennò ne buschi*, "Look out, child, or you'll get a licking." *Calapranzi* is not so much a "tray for bringing dishes from the kitchen," which is *servo muto* (see under *muto*), but "a framework on which dishes, food, etc., are passed from one room or story of a house to another, a lift for dishes" (Webs., R. F., but not in Cr.; see also P.). *Caramella*, add: pop. for "monocle." *Carattere*, add: "disposition." *Carro*, add: "float," especially as used in Renaissance carnival festivities, and also as applied to the lyrics that were sung from the floats. *Cassetta*, "6. box of a stagecoach"; in fact of any carriage. *Catapecchia*, add: "shanty" (Webs., Mur., Cent.). *Chiaro*, add: *chiarissimo* as complimentary term used in addressing learned men. *Chiasso*, add: "alley, tiny street." *Ciancia*, add: "gossip, prattle," as in *il magazzino de le ciance*, "the storehouse of gossip," Tasso's charming reference to the court of Ferrara (*Aminta*, I, 2). *Cicala*, "1. cicada, cricket." There seems to be great confusion in English about this insect. *Cicala* is "cicada," but not "cricket," which is *grillo*. The cause of the difficulty is that we lack, in English, a popular word for the "cicada," which we often call "locust." *Ciottolo*, add: "cobblestone." *Civetta*, "little owl," or better, just "owl." *Colletto*, "detachable collar," or better, just "collar," synonymous with *goletto* and the less common *solino*. *Comizio*, not so much "meeting" as "mass meeting." *Comparsa*, instead of explanation, add: "supernumerary" (Mur.). *Componimento*, "short composition," add: "theme," and note that *composizione* as theme is usually considered a gallicism. *Condimento*, "1. sauce," add: "dressing," in the sense of "salad dressing." *Conveniente*, add: "proper." This word is important because frequently misinterpreted by students.

Though it does also mean "convenient," it is often used for "proper," as e.g., *Proprio, via, questo non è conveniente*—"Really, now, this is not proper." Similarly, *Che sconvenienza!*—"How shocking!" *Corredo*, add: "trousseau," which is sometimes called *corredo da sposa*. *Corrucciare*, "to enrage, to torment," has a weaker sense, especially in the reflexive, meaning "to be chagrined, vexed." *Crema*, add: "custard." Owing to the cognate form this word is almost invariably mistaken by students for "cream," which is *panna*. *Cretino*, "idiot dwarf," just "idiot," "fool," since the idea of dwarf or runt is local or obsolete. *Crosta*, add: "scab." *Cuciniere* "is only used of the cook in an institution; a man-cook in a private house is *Cuoco*, but a woman-cook anywhere may be termed *Cuciniera* as well as *Cuoca*." We feel that *cuciniere* is plausible as an adjective, used, for instance, as *frate cuciniere*, the monk-cook in a monastery (T. B.). But in ordinary language, for "cook," man or woman, *cuciniere* or *cuciniera* would be as much of an affectation as "tonorial artist" for plain "barber." *Disinvolto*, add: "at ease." *Distratto* is a word which students always mistranslate. "Distracted" means, in ordinary English: "mentally disordered, unsettled, mad" (Webs.), all far too strong for *distratto*, which, like the French *distrail*, means merely "absent-minded." "Untrustworthy rascal" for *farabutto* seems to us somewhat tautological, "rascal" suggesting general unreliability anyway. *Fegataccio*, not "unscrupulous man," but what, in colloquial American, we should call "nervy fellow." *Avere fegato* suggests the origin of our adjective "courageous," for to have a heart and to have a liver are both expressions for courage, audacity, even foolhardiness, but not unscrupulousness (Cr., R. F.). *Frantoio*, "olive-crusher," and, by natural extension, "the room or house in which the crushing is done." *Gagliardetto* is now a military term, therefore add: "standard of fascistic units." *Grappa*, "5. brandy"; is it not rather the name given in Northern Italy to a kind of brandy (not in R. F. in this sense)? In *gretto*, "1. shabby, stingy," the order should, we believe, be reversed, for stinginess is the first quality suggested by this word. *Grottesco*, as a literary term, is, to be sure, very young (to be precise, it originated in 1916)¹ and perhaps not permanently settled in the language, so that we shall not insist on a literary definition. *Impazzare*, add: "to curdle," as in *La maionese mi s'è impazzata*, "My mayonnaise has curdled." For *inciellare*, "to place in heaven," we may sometimes use the identically poetic "to ensky," as Shakespeare's "A thing enskied and sainted," in *Measure for Measure*, I, iv, 34, and, if we may be pardoned the abrupt contrast, in D'Annunzio's also beautiful lines:

Nell'aerea chiostra
dei poggi l'Arno pallido s'inciela.
—*Alcione, Beatitudine.*

¹ See Adriano Tilgher, *Studi sul teatro contemporaneo* (Rome, 1923), p. 112, where the word *grottesco*, used as the subtitle of a play, is attributed to Luigi Chiarelli, author of *La maschera e il volto*. See also D. Vittorini, "Il grottesco nel teatro moderno e contemporaneo," *Modern Language Journal*, X, 1 (October, 1925), 21-29.

We should certainly not quarrel with *macchia*, "1. mess, stain," except that "stain" or "spot" is the primary meaning. An Italian Lady Macbeth would surely use "*macchia maledetta*." Our overused "big" is not big enough for *madornale*, which is "huge," as in *uno sbaglio madornale*, "a huge mistake." *Magagna* is explained as "a moral or physical defect," viz., "blemish." *Magari*, "1. as an expression of emphasis, certainly," is insufficiently explained. More often it means willingness: "*Vuoi venire al teatro?*" "*Magari*," "Will you come to the theater?" "I would just as soon." At other times it has a connotation of desire, as in *Magari potesse*, "would that he could," or "I wish that he could." *Malizia*, "malice, cunning," may also suggest "cleverness," as in *Ci vuole un po' di malizia*, "You've got to be clever about it." *Mammella*, not "1. teat, nipple," but "breast." This must have been an accidental omission because in the English-Italian part the word is also given for "breast." *Mancia*, why not "tip"? *Mancino*, "5. (horse) with a certain defect in the feet," viz., with front hoofs pointing outward. *Martinicca*, add: "brake." Under *Matricolare*, "*matricolato*, thorough," hardly translates the expression in which this word is most frequently used: *ladro matricolato*. Sometimes we may use: "professional," "accomplished," "famous" (P.), or, possibly, "full-fledged." Surely *Megera* is "one of the furies," but the word is in polite usage in the sense of "old hag," "old witch" (Cr). It is very strange to note that another jocosely derogatory word, *menna*, is not given by Cr., R. F., or P., though the masculine form, in its very unmasculine meaning, is given by all, and followed by H. *Menna* is often heard popularly in Tuscany for "hag," or "slouchy woman." For *meschino*, add: "mean," in its sense of "puny." *Mescita* is defined as "saloon for the sale of coffee, spirits, etc.," but misleadingly. Coffee is sold and spirits are both sold and served in an average *drogheria* (which, by the way, is never a "chemist's shop"), but *mescita*, so far as Tuscan usage is concerned, is, first of all, never used alone (R. F.), and secondly is always followed by the name of the liquid commodity sold, which is almost invariably wine. *Mescita di vini*, then, "wineshop." The word "sir" for *messere* is insufficient. One might here expect a brief explanation of this ancient word, so preponderantly used for medieval notaries. *Miccia*, on the contrary, is explained as "match for firing an explosive," but not translated as "fuse" (Webs.). *Minuzzolo*, "little bit, scrap," is specifically and very commonly used for "crumb," cf. French *miette*. We do not see just why *miscuglio* should be a "sorry mixture." For a really sorry mixture perhaps *guazzabuglio* might do better. *Misfatto*, "misdeed," has surely become, by natural extension, "crime" (R. F.). *Mobile*, "as . . . piece of furniture," also by natural extension comes to mean "junk," and, if applied to a person, means "good-for-nothing," as in Giacosa's *Tristi amori*, Act III, scene i, where Ranetti exclaims: "Che farne di quel mobile?" "We have no use for that good-for-nothing." To *mole*, "large mass of any kind," one might add: "bulk." The word *monello*, "urchin," suggests primarily "mischief," "naughty boy," in which sense it is doubtless mentioned by H., quoting P., "in the sense in which

a woman says to her husband when he has made her a present, 'Oh! You shouldn't!' " This charming, mid-Victorian idea is not even mentioned by Cr. and R. F., and should one wish to express such a singularly anachronistic thought at all, "rascal," "rogue," "villain," would be equally ineloquent. *Monna*, "Madonna, Mrs." is surely inexact. For Dante's "*Monna Vanna e monna Laga*" (*Rime*, LII), we must surely say "Mistress" or "Lady," not "Mrs." In these days when the horse is almost obsolete, equine words seem to be losing their importance. Accordingly, *morello*, "nearly black," is, indeed, actually "black," when, as usual, the color is applied to a horse. The word *noia* surely does usually mean "weariness," "tedium," "nuisance," but at times, in older Italian as in French literature, it assumes a more serious sense of "trouble," "sorrow." It has unquestionably the purport of grief in Dante's: "Ma tu, perchè ritorni a tanta noia," *Inf.*, I, 76, where it means indeed, "torment," and in Tasso's *Aminta*, when the protagonist, who, for the second time, wants to kill himself, exclaims:

Bello e dolce morir fu certo allora
 Che uccidere io mi volsi.
 Tu me 'l negasti, e 'l cielo, a cui pareo
 Ch'io precorressi co 'l morir la noia
 Ch'apprestata m'avea.

—Act III, scene ii.

Much might be written on Leopardi's conception of *noia*, an emotional vacuum which was in itself a grief. *Occasione* is more than the English "occasion"; it is the proper word for "opportunity." Under *ordine*, H. enumerates Italian orders of chivalry, the second of which is not *ufficiale*, but *cavaliere ufficiale*. Unless we are very much mistaken, *pace* was a term of greeting in old Italian. We remember it in connection, for instance, with the spurious, but nevertheless interesting episode of Dante in the Lunigiana, and his alleged conversation with Fra Ilario. *Palina*, add: "grove in which saplings are grown for posts." *Panino*, "dim. pane," is what we commonly call "roll." *Partecipare* is surely "to share, or . . . to impart," but is very frequently used for "to announce," just as *partecipazione* means "announcement" (cf. French *faire part*). The past participle of *patire*, *patito*, is not merely used *scherz.* as "lover"; as an adjective it means "one who has suffered," therefore "thin," "worn," "emaciated." For *peluria*, we find: "down of birds, or the soft hair of young animals," yes, and particularly the incipient whiskers on masculine, adolescent, human animals. It would be very useful, particularly for students indulging in literary criticism, to know that *personaggio*, "personage," is the very word for *dramatis persona*, or, in general, 'character, in fiction.' In Tuscany it is very common to hear *pesca*, or rather, the plural *pesche*, not only for "bruise, lump from a blow" (the latter is jocosely called also *corno*), but for "dark lines or circles under the eyes." Since, as was said before, H. has added, in this edition, all terms brought in by the war, might we not legitimately wish included the pop. *pescecane*, "profiteer"? The word

"black-beetle" for *piattola*, is, we feel, rather euphemistic, for plain "cockroach." In explaining *pizzicotto* as "a pinch taken with the tips of all five fingers," one must disagree with H. and agree with P. and R. F. that a pinch must be given, to be effective, with only two fingers. *Pizzico*, instead, is, as P. says: "quanta roba si prende coi cinque polpastrelli riuniti." The crux seems to lie, here, in what is meant by *roba*. We might explain that *pizzicotto* is a pinch when applied to human flesh, while *pizzico* is used for, say, a pinch of salt. It is not enough to define *poppatoio* as "artificial nipple," for it is often used in the sense of "bottle," for instance: *Questo bambino è stato allevato col poppatoio*, "This child has been raised on a bottle." The two words "pocket-book" and "purse" are frequently confused nowadays in America, though they really refer to two similar but distinct things (Webs.). Likewise, in Italian, *portafoglio* is not merely "portfolio," but "pocket-book," while "purse" is *borsa*. *Potere*, "to be able," has also the stronger meaning, "to have power," "to be potent," as in Dante: "Poesia, più che 'l dolor, potè il digiuno" (*Inf.*, xxxiii, 75), translated by Norton as "Then fasting had more power than grief." *Premere* is a singularly significant verb and does not merely mean "to press"; with a dative pronoun it means: "to be concerned, to be eager," as in Don Rodrigo's famous phrase (*Promessi sposi*, chap. vi), "In somma, padre ... non capisco altro se non che ci dev'essere qualche fanciulla che le preme molto," "In short, father, all I know is that there must be some girl on whom you are very keen," or "about whom you are much concerned." *Quota*, add: "club dues." *Raccapricciare* is a word that challenges accurate English translation. "To shudder" is quite insufficient. The verb is used more often in its participial, adjectival form: *raccapricciante*, "shocking," in the most virulent meaning of the word and very close to "horrifying," even sometimes "heart-rending," "revolting with almost physical disgust." *Vidi quello scontro ferroviario; fu uno spettacolo raccapricciante*: "I saw that train collision; it was a horrible sight." An excellent example of the use of the noun *raccapriccio* can be found in Roberto Bracco's *Il piccolo santo*, Act V, scene vi, when, at the tragical culmination of the act, the "Little Saint" discovering Barbarello's awful crime, the stage direction says: "Don Fiorenzo (arrestandosi in una fulminea soffocazione di sorpresa e di raccapriccio)," where the word undoubtedly means "horror." *Radicchio*, add: "a sort of chicory eaten as salad." *Ruzzare* is a little more than "to play, as children," for it is far more often used for animals in the sense of "to be playful," e.g.: *Guardi come ruzzava quel cucciolo*, "See how playful that puppy is." *Scaleo*, defined as "steps on wheels for a library," is just our common "stepladder" (Mur.). We legitimately object to the inclusion of such an illiterate barbarism as *sciantosa*, from the French *chanteuse*. Since it is used only for café-concert singers of a very low order, *canzonettista* would be far better.¹ For *scollato*, add: "décolleté" or "low-necked." *Scutellarsi* has all the earmarks of a dialectal form from Southern Italy. It is not in R. F. and is called by P. "volg." It should be

¹ We regret to say that Prospero Viani's *Dizionario di pretesi Francesismi e di pretesi soci e forme erronee della lingua italiana* (Firenze: Le Monnier; 2 vols.) is inaccessible to us.

indicated that this form is not in good usage, especially since there is a good word: *accoltellare*, "to knife." *Sottana* is today not "petticoat," but "skirt" (Webs.). *Vago*, add: "fair," in its more literary sense. In fact, *The Fair Maid of Perth* should be: *La vaga donzella di Perth*, and Sacchetti's famous lyric, which begins *O vaghe montanine pastorelle*, should be rendered: "O fair mountain shepherdesses."

4. *Definitions*.—Since this *Dictionary* is meant chiefly for students, though lengthy definitions are proscribed for reasons of space, yet, in certain cases, to convey clarity they should be included, especially because, in general, Mr. Hoare's definitions are richly enlightening. A student with a modicum of curiosity might wonder, for example, why *Ambrosiano* should mean "Milanese," unless he were told not merely that St. Ambrose was "Bishop of Milan," but that he is the patron saint of that city. Similarly, he might ask why, under *Antonio*, the phrase, *Dio ti protegga e Sant'Antonio*, should be "said to one who is saying or doing something disgusting," unless there were added the plausible explanation that St. Anthony is popularly regarded as the patron saint of animals in general and pigs in particular. Under *Dolce*, "9. *Dolce e forte*, pork, venison, etc. with sharp sauce," is a very ambiguous description of this Lucullan dish. This culinary delicacy is so called because the meat, often tongue, after being boiled with spices, is stewed in a gravy made up mainly of sugar and vinegar, hence the *dolce e forte*. See any Italian cookbook and preferably Pellegrino Artusi, *La scienza in cucina e l'arte di mangiar bene* (Firenze, 1900), page 196. The definition of *fascismo* as "league of ex-service men" was adequate in 1919, but is quite insufficient today. *Mezzaiuolo*, "peasant who cultivates a farm on the *métayer* system, paying a proportion of the produce as rent" is true, but one might add that that proportion is exactly half, hence the word. Under *Palatino*, "biblioteca palatina, private library of the old princely house at Florence," one might add, for the information of young scholars, that this collection is now part of the Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale. "*Mal di petto*, disease of the chest," is the usual name for "pneumonia." In Tuscany, *palanca*, "2. a Soldo, half penny," is still heard among the lowly, but it is distinctly of popular, if not obsolescent, usage. "*Pallato*, marked with round spots," is used mainly for horses, and especially for bay horses.

5. *Idioms*.—It is in the usage of idioms that utter familiarity with a language is particularly manifested, and some of them challenge translation. They are the most characteristic and subtle media of expression. Mr. Hoare's *Dictionary* is extraordinarily rich in idioms, culled chiefly from P.

Bacato suggests the common idiom: *fiorentino bacato*, applied to Florentine vulgar vernacular. Under *barba*, any epicurean pedant might wish to find *barba di cappuccini*, a peculiarly Italian salad for which there is, to our knowledge, no name in English, since the thing itself is probably unknown in English countries. It is significant of the Italian point of view that a very frequent remark, immediately following greetings, might be: *Cosa ha fatto*

di bello? literally, "What fine thing have you been doing?" or, as we should put it in this country: "What's the good word?" This very translation, in which *bello* is freely rendered by "good," seems very characteristic of national differences, the Italians, as naturally trained aesthetes, referring to the beautiful, while the traditionally moral Anglo-Saxon shows his greater interest in the good. Perhaps it would be pedantic to add, under *bufala*, *uova di bufala*, a special kind of cheese very common in Southern Italy, particularly in the Abruzzi, where buffaloes of a tame variety pasture freely, and where cheese made from buffalo milk is sold in round forms that look like huge eggs. *Cascare* suggests the common expression: *Ebbene, casca il mondo?* "Well, what of it?" *Cassino de' cani* means "dog-catcher's wagon." *Catinella* reminds one of the proverb: *Cielo a pecorelle, acqua a catinelle*. Fleecy clouds, sometimes called "cat's tail" or "mare's tail" (Webs.) are here meant. In journalism and specifically in journalistic advertising, the verb *cestinare* has become very common in the eloquently succinct *cestinansi anonimi*, viz., "Anonymous replies will be thrown into the waste basket." *Far cilecca* means not only "to fail," but "to fool," even "to dodge." In fact, in Paolo Minucci's comment on that most peculiar of mock heroic epics, Lorenzo Lippi's *Il Malmantile racquistato*, and precisely in his explanation of Canto VII, stanza 25, he defines *fare cilecca* as: "fare una burla, ... finger di voler fare una cosa, e poi non la fare."¹ *Estremi conforti* (Cr.) are the "last rites." In the example, *chiocciola che va a menadito*, the real idiom calls for *chiocciolone*, which is the jocular word for "watch" or "clock." *Mettere cervello* means more than "to begin to be careful," and is very close to *metter giudizio*, "to get some sense." *Fare a miccino* is "to stint." *Molla* and *mollare* give rise to two idioms that might here be added: *non lo toccherai colle molle*, equivalent to our popular: "I would not touch it with a ten-foot pole"; and *il tira e molla*, literally, "pull and slacken," viz., "playing fast and loose," as in Verga's *Cavalleria rusticana*, Turiddu's: "La volontà di Dio la fate col tira e molla come vi torna conto!" *Fare il morto* means "to float"; *fare il muso*, "to pout," "to be grouchy, sulky." Under *perdere* we should add: *darsi per perso*, "to lose all hope," "to think one's self lost." *Non si periti* is very common for "do not hesitate." It is not astonishing that Mr. Hoare should be unfamiliar with *piè di porco*, "a short crowbar used by burglars in breaking open doors" (Webs.) and commonly called a "jimmy." The source of the Italian word is, doubtless, due to the resemblance of this instrument to a pig's foot. Under *sangue, cavallo di sangue* is a "spirited, high-strung horse"; *puro sangue* means "thoroughbred" (as given in English-Italian part), and, journalistically, *fatto di sangue*, "crime."

6. *Etymologies*.—This reviewer now admits being in a subject which is not his specialty. The following remarks, therefore, are in the nature of mere conjectures, made with all possible modesty and hesitation.²

¹ See Sonzogno ed. (Milan, 1889), p. 261.

² For references to etymological authorities we use the following abbreviations: M. L. for W. Meyer-Lübke, *Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg, 1911; D. for Friedrich Diez, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der romanischen Sprachen*, Bonn, 1887, and A.G.I. for *Archivio glottologico italiano*.

Baccano (etymology omitted by H., Z., M. L., and D.) is explained (Pian.) as coming from *Bacchus*, *bacchanal* (see *A.G.I.*, IV, 387). *Busdroghe*, a word omitted by R. F., Cr., Pian., M. L., D., and *A.G.I.*, but included by P., who gives variants, though not explained etymologically by any of these authorities, doubtless derives, through popular corruption, from "bulldog." *Ciao*, which H. calls "perhaps a corruption of *Schiavo suo*" (word omitted by M. L., D., and *A.G.I.*),¹ is undoubtedly a North Italian dialectal corruption of *schiaivo*. As a term of farewell we find the entire word *schiaivo* in as recent an author as Vincenzo Martini, in *Il cavaliere d'industria* (1845), at the end of Act II: "*Schiaivo, Signori*," "Goodbye, gentlemen." We do not see why H. omits the etymology of *messere*, which is obviously from Provençal *messer* (Pian.). *Prua* (omitted by M. L.) is surely "a variant of *Prora*," and furthermore it is exactly the Genoese form which, owing to the maritime authority of Genoa, asserted itself throughout the language (D. did not point out this dialectal origin, but see E. G. Parodi's *Studi liguri* in *A.G.I.*, XVI, 344). In suggesting a possible derivation of *ronzino* (omitted by M. L., D., and *A.G.I.*), "nag," from *rozzo* and Latin *russus* (cf. French *rosse*), H. adds: "It is to be observed that horses of a marked red colour are often crossgrained creatures." We must, in this case, stand up in defense of these much maligned horses, and assert that in our abundant equine experience no such trait was ever observed or heard of, and that this explanation is quite unconvincing, whatever may be the occult truth. For *scombussolare* (omitted by Z., M. L., D., and *A.G.I.*), "to upset completely," we find a long description of its possible etymologies (Pian.) from *bussolo*, "money box," or "more probably from *L. ex-compulsare*, to strike." Would it be totally illicit to connect it instead with *bussola*, "compass," especially in view of the common idiom: *perdere la bussola*, "to lose one's head," "to be utterly upset"? These difficult problems we leave to expert etymologists.

7. *Omissions*.—There are no important omissions at all. The following might, indeed, be considered rather petty: *Carnesecca* (Cr., R. F.), "bacon"; *dovechè*, which should really be ascribed to the personal choice of an author in joining two separate words, and which is usually omitted (P.), is, nevertheless, found with the special meaning of "while," in Rovani, *I cento anni*.² *Intombare*, "to entomb," is found in Carducci's *Intermezzo*:

Dona, Paro gentil, tanto di sasso
Ch'io v'intombi il mio cuore.

Infrequent in literature, but common at least in Tuscany, is *limonaia* (not in P. nor in R. F.), "large room or barn in which lemon plants are stored in winter"; *pimpinnacolo* (P.) for "tiny turret," such as those that decorate the cathedral of Milan; and, finally, *sbrandolio*, popular for "display," as used, for instance, by Fucini, in *La visita del prefetto*.

¹ See, however, *Jahrbuch für romanische und englische Literatur*, XV, 200.

² Milano, Istituto Editoriale Italiano, II, 292.

8. *Typographical errors*.—Here again, this book is so magnificently edited and printed that one feels guilty of pedantry in finding even a minimum of errors. For the sake, however, of that thoroughness to which we are groveling slaves, here are a half-dozen tiny slips that should be corrected.

Under *adagio*, the idiom *Adagio biagio* should read *Adagio Biagio*; under formations of *Attil*, correct to *Attil*, as for *Attilatamente*; not *fôgo*, but *fogo*; under *Maremma*, not *Orbitello* but *Orbetello*; under *maschio*, "*7. pietre a maschia e femina*," change to *maschio*; not *palpèbra*, but *pálpebra*, though the word does become paroxitonic in rhyme, as *tenebra*; finally, on page 568, *manganella*, which occurs at the end of the line, should not be divided as *mangan-ella*, but as *manga-nella*, according to Italian syllabication.

III. ENGLISH-ITALIAN PART

In the first edition this part was so brief as to be barely adequate, and its brevity gave to the volume a certain disproportion, even though we all grant the far greater importance, to English-speaking students, of the Italian-English side. With the additions now made, this part decidedly comes up to the standard set so high by the first part. No student of Italian composition need make serious mistranslations with this guidance, particularly if, in cases of doubt, he will check up his word in the Italian-English side, which is naturally much richer in examples and idioms.

For the prodigious labor expended by Mr. Hoare for the last fifteen years on this superb example of lexicography, all lovers of Italian will feel a deep and unceasing gratitude. For providing us all with such an invaluable companion and interpreter we hardly know how to thank him, and we hope that these prolix critical comments will in no way diminish in his or anybody else's view our unstinted admiration.

RUDOLPH ALTROCCHI

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

L'évolution du verbe en anglo-français (XII^e-XIV^e siècles). By F. J. TANQUEREY. Paris: Champion, 1915. Pp. xxiv+868.

Of all the works thus far published by F. J. Tanquerey on Anglo-Norman, his *Évolution du verbe en anglo-français* is perhaps his most ambitious contribution; it deserves more than a belated notice. Differing from the view held long ago by Gaston Paris (*Vie de Saint Gilles*, p. xxxv) that the Anglo-Norman dialect "*n'a jamais été qu'une manière imparfaite de parler le français*," Tanquerey believes that Anglo-Norman "*a été une langue d'un genre spécial, langue littéraire avec son évolution et son usage propres*," and that it developed independently from continental dialects. The influence of English on written Anglo-Norman has been of little importance, according to Tanquerey. Anglo-Norman has preserved its vocabulary practically intact, its syntax has

been little affected, and its conjugation has evinced no trace of influence. As concerns the spoken language, however, Anglo-Norman pronunciation, cut off as it was from continental French, underwent a considerable modification. Furthermore, Anglo-Norman is characterized by its rapid evolution, the mixture of forms of various ages, and the confusion found in its phonology. Tanqueray's conclusions were reached upon the examination of diplomatic, political, private, and legal texts and a large number of representative Anglo-Norman literary works.

The object of this voluminous work—a complete tabulation of Anglo-Norman verbal forms during three centuries of their evolution—is meritorious: Tanqueray's contribution has come to fill a special need and will throw light on a field beset with difficulties. This is a suggestive and, on the whole, a thoroughly laudable undertaking. Unfortunately, this study leaves something to be desired in its execution; it obviously shows evidences of overhastiness, and its diffuseness impairs somewhat its usefulness; in fact, it could have been arranged better and considerably condensed without harm to the subject matter. Greater care in checking up references and drawing conclusions should also have been used. Moreover, the author should have observed more consistently the method of dealing with texts which he outlined for himself in his Introduction; the language of the author is not always kept strictly separate from that of the scribe, and the reader is at times at a loss what to think about the instances quoted; exceptional forms which originate sporadically from the carelessness and ignorance of the copyist, even though these forms may occur several times in the same text, must be accepted with caution. Finally, it would have benefited the work had the author consulted more recent editions. Nevertheless the work is noteworthy for the mass of material it contains and for the large variety of texts examined; in spite of a few minor errors which can easily be corrected, it will render appreciable service.

The following remarks refer only to texts that were conveniently accessible to the reviewer. Page 7: Etymological forms, first person singular, claimed by Tanqueray to be given by Gaston Paris in the Introduction to his *Vie de St. Gilles* are not found. Pages 10–11: Very doubtful that the author of the *Vie St. Edmund* (Harvey ed.) ever wrote the first person singular with an *e*; the rhyme-words offer no proof, and the few cases (543, 602, 653, 721, 2167, 2325, 3802) in which an *e* appears within the line are due to the scribe's spelling. Page 12: The vocalization of *l* in *apeu* (Chardri, *Petit Plet*, 439) occurs within the line and may not be Chardri's. Page 25: *richoise:envoise* (*St. Gilles*, 2150) is to be read *richeise: enveise*. Page 37: Tanqueray contends that French knows both forms, *traï* and *trais*, first person singular, but "l'anglo-français ne semble employer que la seconde"; the *St. Edmund* shows, however, *trei* twice within the line (18, 721). Page 47: In his discussion of the presence in the works of the same author of imperfect and conditional forms, first

person singular, with or without the elision of final *e*, Tanquerey states that "dans les trois poèmes de Chardri nous pouvons observer une progression significative: de l'un à l'autre, on peut clairement voir le nombre de formes correctes diminuer constamment"; a closer study of such cases in Chardri shows the evidence to be inconclusive. It is almost idle to speculate or to venture such a contention in the case of an author whose versification is far from being faultless; in some cases future forms may be substituted for conditional, and there are too few such cases in the *Josaphat* and the *Vie des set dormans* to reach any definite conclusion. Page 49: Tanquerey raises some doubt as to whether or not *durrei* (*St. Edmund*, 601) is a conditional with an *e* elided; the context and meter call for the future. Page 57: The graphy *ei* for *ai* in the future tense is not uncommon in the *St. Edmund*, but this fact proves nothing as concerns the author's language, since *ai* in the future rhymes with itself only. Pages 93-95: Tanquerey finds in the *St. Edmund* only five instances of hiatus which he considers doubtful; true, only one (1887) quoted by him is plainly a case of non-elision while the others are, indeed, doubtful; after commenting on these cases, Tanquerey further states that "il ne reste pas un seul cas probable de non-élision dans tout le poème"; yet about forty such cases have been counted by the reviewer (cf. *Modern Philology*, XII, 573). Page 110: *lest*, third person singular (Gaimar, *L'estorie des Engles*), may be ascribed to the copyist only. Page 112: Tanquerey considers the rhyme *lest: vest* (*St. Edmund*, 1363) as "le plus ancien exemple que nous ayons relevé pour les thèmes à dentale," and claims further that "il est assuré dans une certaine mesure par la rime"; the scribe must be held responsible for such a rhyme; it should be read *lait: vait*, or *let: vet*; *vait* without an *s* regularly appears in the rhyme in the same poem. Page 144: *veit*, third person singular, *aller* (*St. Gilles*, 1513), rhymes with *leit* from Latin *lacte* and not with *leit* from *laisser* as suggested by Tanquerey. Page 145: Tanquerey remarks that *va*, third person singular, is found in Simund de Freine only within the line and may not be ascribed to the author; however, Matzke quoted (p. xli) a rhyme *va: la* (*Roman de Philosophie*, 699). Page 145: Tanquerey's contention that in Anglo-Norman two authors may live in the same period and still use two languages that are quite different possibly explains his dating of Robert de Gretham and particularly Denis Piramus as late as 1230. With regard to the latter poet, however, no tangible reasons are offered by Tanquerey which would justify this dating; on the contrary, scholars have generally placed him in the last part of the twelfth century, and Tanquerey's comments on Piramus' correct language and versification throughout his study would tend to support this view. Page 145: Tanquerey gives from the *Vie de St. Gilles* two cases of *va* which escaped Gaston Paris' attention, but the correct rhyme is *va: la* 1818, and the correct reference for the second case *va: suna* is 2532. Page 145: Tanquerey was unable to find "dans un même poème des exemples assurés par la rime de ces trois formes [*vait*, *veit*, *vet*, third person singular, *aller*] mais elles

sont librement mélangées après le *Saint Edmund*"; yet in the latter poem four different forms are attested by the rhyme: *veit:feit* 529, *veit:dreit* 785, *vet:set* (*septem*) 3850, *va:a* 1843. Page 147: *estait* 1985 (correctly 1995), third person singular of *ester*, rhymes in the *St. Gilles* with *lait* from Latin *lacte* and not from *laisser* as stated. Page 153: Tanqueray remarks that the old and correct form *puet* or *estuet* is not common in Anglo-Norman and quotes an instance from the *St. Gilles*, but his reference is incorrect, and *estot* is the only form found there (685, 1705; cf. *St. Gilles*, p. xxxiv, n. 2). Page 156: Tanqueray cites *vult* (*St. Gilles*, 620), but *volt* is read instead (cf. l. 481). Page 261: Commenting on the imperfect and conditional endings, third person plural, Tanqueray states that in the beginning of the thirteenth century "un tout petit nombre d'auteurs ... ne connaissent que la terminaison dissyllabique," and refers to Robert de Gretham and Denis Piramus as such authors, but on page 263, Tanqueray contradicts the foregoing statement when he says: "Dans le *Saint Edmund* le nombre des formes abrégées est supérieur à celui des formes correctes"; here the author fails to note that *-ent*, conditional 6, is not elided in the *St. Edmund*. Pages 267-68: A propos of the syllabic value of *-ent*, present indicative and subjunctive 6, Tanqueray correctly states that Robert de Gretham and Denis Piramus "ne présentent aucune forme abrégée au subjonctif et à l'indicatif," but on the next page it is claimed that in the *St. Edmund* "les présents du subjonctif réguliers sont quatre fois, les présents de l'indicatif douze fois plus nombreux que les formes irrégulières des temps correspondants"; the two cases quoted from the latter work are doubtful. Pages 397-98: Tanqueray found only three thirteenth-century texts with no infinitives of the third conjugation rhyming with words in *-er* and remarks that the number of authors and rhymes attested is "mince": the *St. Laurent* has one, the *St. Julien* one, and the *St. Edmund* two; yet, in the *St. Laurent* infinitives in *-er* rhyme only with themselves, and in the *St. Edmund* are found about ten attested regular rhymes. Page 418: The infinitive form *treier* for *traire* (*St. Edmund*, 3768) appears within the line only; *traire* is regular in the rhyme. Page 456: The participial form *eant* (from *avoir*), found supposedly in the *St. Edmund*, is given without any reference. Pages 477-78: Instances of past participles in *i* changed to *e* as cited by Tanqueray (*tapez:adure*, 715, 72) cannot be located in the *St. Edmund*, and such rhymes do not exist, in fact, in this poem. Page 483: Tanqueray thinks the form *estaits* (*St. Edmund*, 412, 2172, 3880) to be a past participle of *ester* which took an *i*; this is doubtful, and it cannot be looked upon as "une véritable acquisition"; this form is continental (cf. *Roman de Thèbes*, 1320, and Chrétien de Troyes, Foerster's *Glossary*) and not exclusively Anglo-Norman. Page 486: From the *St. Edmund* Tanqueray quotes a past participle in *u*, *arestu:fu*, without giving any reference; the only participial form attested by the rhyme in this text is *aresté* 361, 3650. Page 488: *sentu* for *senti* (*St. Edmund*, *assentue:hue*, 2371) is a wrong reference; this rhyme cannot be located in this text. Page 492:

ceüe, past participle of *cheoir* (*St. Edmund*, 45), is not found in this line, but *chai* (389) is attested by the rhyme and also appears several times within the line. Pages 498 and 518-19: Tanquerey quotes *seü*, past participle of *savoir*, from the *St. Edmund* (1560) as a first instance of contraction, but this word is obviously dissyllabic according to the meter. Page 532: *treiz*, past participle of *traire* (*St. Edmund*, 2725), cited as a case of contraction, is regularly monosyllabic (cf. *ibid.*, 329, 883, 2156). Page 540: *suffoent* for *suffoissent* (*St. Edmund*, 3147) considered as rare by Tanquerey is doubtful; the text and meter seem to call for the singular form, *suffoisse*. Page 551: It is true that two instances of imperfect endings in *oue* escaped Gaston Paris' attention (*St. Gilles*), but they are within the line. Page 552: The *St. Edmund* knows only one form of imperfect ending, first conjugation, *ouent*, and not two (*ouent* and *oent*) as stated; *quidoent* 2990, stands for *quident* and is a present tense. Page 560: *resteit* (*St. Edmund*, 2704) for *restout* should be read *n'esteit*. Page 566: Tanquerey thinks the imperfect ending in *oi* rare in the works of Chardri, Robert de Gretham, and in the *St. Edmund*; this form is not to be found in the latter text, and *aportoient* 3105, within the line, stands for *aportouent*. Page 570: *ierent*, imperfect 6, *aller*: *porterent* (*St. Edmund*, 753) should be read *i erent*. Pages 577-78 and 759: *ie* or *ye* for *i*, which is a spelling found in preterite forms such as *oyerent*:*departirent* (*St. Edmund*, 2665), is to be ascribed to the copyist; this spelling frequently occurs in other words in the same poem, and no rhyme proves conclusively that the author used a preterite of the second conjugation with an ending of the first; in this particular case, at least, Tanquerey's contention that doubtful rhymes are significant rhymes is open to serious objections. Page 598: Tanquerey declares that preterites in *-dedi* do not exist in Anglo-Norman, but this form occurs once in the *St. Edmund*: *lié: expandié* 2526. Page 605: Tanquerey states that the preterite form of *avoir*, *ot* for *out*, "est attestée par la rime pour la première fois dans la *Vie de Saint Gilles*: *ot: trot* 1721"; as the text indicates, this form *ot* is from Latin *audit* and not *habuit* (cf. also l. 419); the same mistake was made by Gaston Paris (*St. Gilles*, p. xxxiv). Pages 653 and 808: *joindrent*, preterite (*St. Edmund*, 670), quoted by Tanquerey as illustrating the influence of the infinitive, is an incorrect reading and should be read *i vindrent*; the author is right to consider this form as "un peu invraisemblable à cette date." Page 706: Tanquerey gives a case of metathesis in the future tense, *obumberrai* (Philippe de Thau's *Bestiaire*, 2530), but the MSS show *ebumbreit*, *obumbereit*, *enumbreit*, a conditional form. Page 707: Contrary to Tanquerey's statement, *irrai* spelled with two *r*'s is found in the *St. Edmund*, 726, 2237. Page 810: Such a form as *trea*, preterite (*St. Edmund*, 1219), most probably stands for *trestit*, an imperfect tense.

Certain references are incorrectly given. From *Vie de St. Gilles*, page 101: *atendit: vit* 1179; page 113: *languist: mesfit* 143; page 155: *poit: estoit* 3140. From *Vie St. Edmund*, page 10: *cunt: Edmund* 199; *recorde: morte* 2917; page

127: *descumfite:abite* 893; page 261: line 4111 is wrong, there are only 4,033 lines in the poem. From *Quatre Livre des Reis* (Curtius ed.), page 74: *muerz* I, 25, 28; page 111: *faist* II, 22, 12, which Tanquerey considers as "le plus ancien exemple"; page 292: *guste* II, 22, 17; page 298: *cuceit* I, 12, 7. From Gaimar, *L'estorie des Engles*; page 4: *Bien le je vous jure*, etc., 688; page 248: *reuseront:erent*, *menerunt:chemirent*, no references given. From Chardri, *Josaphat*, page 25: *dut* 837; page 47: read "2582" for "2562"; page 51: read "2137" for "2157"; *Petit Plet*, page 73: read "123" for "133"; page 92: read "543" for "547"; page 48: read "492" for "462." From Adgar, *Légendes de Marie*, page 7:1, *Eg*, 19; XVII, 516, 613; page 32 note: VII, 154. Certain verb forms are not correctly printed. From *Boeve de Haumtone*, page 41: *renc:touchant* for *renc:trenchant*; page 11: *command:vaillans* for *comand:vailans*; page 292: *mundu* for *mande*. From *Quatre Livre des Reis*, page 35: *suis* for *sui* II, 7, 18; page 76: *fai* for *fais* III, 19, 13; page 373: *dis* for *di* I, 20, 6.

HENRY E. HAXO

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA

BRIEFER MENTION

We are informed by Professor A. C. McLaughlin that the American Historical Association is seeking to obtain an endowment of \$1,000,000. One reason for this effort, he explains, is that there are tasks awaiting and demanding proper investigation that can be carried on effectively only if conducted on a large scale and with co-operating workers. Funds are needed, as in the natural sciences, for pure research. Sources need to be located and described, especially sources for economic, social, and sectional history; expensive field work is necessary. The Association believes that such researches will be of value to workers in all the social sciences and should be of interest and value to the public. If the big foundation tasks are left to the individual worker without assistance or co-operation, they will be done only after many years and probably not properly at all. Even the study of American dialect and the American language is closely associated with migrations, the social and economic tasks and experiences of the American people, and research in this field must also be endowed to enable it to be prosecuted in a thorough manner and on historical lines.

Professor Archer Taylor, of the University of Chicago, has been appointed one of the editors of *FF Communications*, published by the Finnish Academy of Sciences. The publication is devoted to the printing of classified lists of folk-lore materials and to special studies and monographs. More than sixty numbers have already appeared. It is the only folk-lore publication having an international editorial board and serving primarily international scholarly interests. The other editors are Kaarle Krohn (Helsingfors), Walter Anderson (Dorpat), Johannes Bolte (Berlin), Knut Liestøl (Oslo), and C. W. von Sydow (Lund).

Perhaps the latest of the *Festschriften* to be published in Paris during the past year is the *Mélanges d'histoire du Moyen Age offerts à M. Ferdinand Lot par ses amis et ses élèves*.¹ There is a photograph of M. Lot as frontispiece and a Bibliography of his writings (prepared by Halphen and Fawtier), followed by forty-two articles dealing with medieval French history, literature, and philology. The philological articles are only six in number: "Remarques sur vingt passages difficiles de la *Chanson de Roland*" (Bédier), "Notice sur le *Livres des Trois Eages*" (P. Champion), "Un sirventés politique de 1230" (Jeanroy), "Le double esprit et l'unité du *Lancelot en prose*" (Mme Lot-

¹ Champion, 1925. Pp. xii + 767.

Borodine), "Le roman en prose de Perceval" (Pauphilet), and "Pour le commentaire d'Aucassin et Nicolette 'esclairier le cuer'" (M. Roques). The historical material, with few exceptions, will also be of interest to workers in medieval literature, notably Bémont's discussion of the bull of Hadrian IV which conferred Ireland upon Henry II, Dihigo's article discrediting two Moslem traditions concerning Charlemagne's entry into Spain, and Iorga's observations upon the crusader's influence on Mohammedan civilization. Ganshof, in an excellent article, seeks to re-establish the authenticity of Lambert d'Ardres' *Chronique*: for those literary historians who are not familiar with this valuable source for study of late twelfth-century life, this may serve as a charming introduction. Ganshof's remarks on medieval Latin style (p. 232) are worthy of note.

Bédier seeks to defend the following readings of *O* against certain commentators of the *Roland*: verses 366, 453, 517, 588, 727, 829, 1152, 1619, 1685, 1785, 1844, 1946, 2124, 2242, 2845, 3012, 3440, 3758, 3809. With possibly one or two exceptions¹ the reader is forced to accede. Especially brilliant are his emendation of *descent* to *desceint* in verse 2849, and his explanation of *gerun* in verse 3812. *Le Livre des Trois Eages*, of Pierre Choinet, astrologer and physician of Louis XI, has an interesting passage of some one hundred and fifty lines on fifteenth-century political theory. This poem dates about 1475. M. Jeanroy has republished, with improvement of text, commentary, and translation, the poem of the unknown Namoros dau Luc which was discovered by Bertoni in 1901. Mme Lot-Borodine would see in the *Lancelot* of the Vulgate cycle the "sceau d'un génie individuel et non les traces d'une tourbe de conteurs." The apparent dualism of the ascetic and the profane she reconciles very charmingly. The most that we can conclude, however, is that this lengthy work could have been the labor of a single individual. M. Pauphilet vindicates the importance of the *Didot-Perceval*, and adds that it was absolutely necessary to bring into unity the two poems of Robert de Boron: the two poems and the prose romance form a perfect trilogy. M. Roques translates *esclairier le cuer* by "relieve the heart." He commends Professor Jenkins for this definition in the latter's *Roland* vocabulary, but he adds that Jenkins was wrong to include the meaning "to lighten" (p. 729). Obviously M. Roques had forgotten for the moment that there are two verbs "to lighten" in English: the one meaning "to light up" but the other a synonym of "to relieve."

The classification of M. Lot's Bibliography into subject divisions is to be regretted. The purpose of such a list is that we may follow the scholar's career year by year, observe with what his interest began and how it varied as time went on. Surely an arrangement in mere chronological order would have been

¹ Notably *vers*, in vs. 727, which I should continue to retain with the reading "boar." This translation is also possible in vs. 577 of the *Chanson de Guillaume*. This seems to be the understanding of Gröber (in his transcription of Digby 23, *Bibliotheca Romanica*, Nos. 53, 54) as well as of G. Paris and of T. A. Jenkins.

of more worth to the admirers of Ferdinand Lot, much more so than a series of historical subdivisions. Need one mention the splendid typography of all of M. Edouard Champion's publications? Only one error has reached my attention: *rostre* for *nostre*, on page 118.—URBAN T. HOLMES.

The late Wendelin Foerster's *Altfranzösisches Übungsbuch* (Eduard Koschwitz was associated with only the first edition of the work, 1884) was solicitously emended and improved by its author up to the year of his death (1914). New items or corrections of detail were also sent in by Romance scholars in other countries, by A. Thomas, the late Jean Acher, and E. C. Armstrong, among others. Aside from the diplomatic reprint of the MSS of the *Vie Saint-Alexis*, and aside from an extensive passage from the *Roland*, the *Übungsbuch* necessarily contains little for those whose interest is literary rather than linguistic. To furnish a series of practice texts from the rich fields of Old French literature, works whose interest is literary as well as linguistic and which belong in the later as well as the earlier periods, is evidently the aim of a new series planned by A. Hilka, of Göttingen, and G. Rohlf, of Berlin. The first issue of this *Sammlung Romanischer Übungstexte* contains six Old French "Fables" (why not *Fableaux*? but, at any rate, we prefer not to see *Fabliaux*—a Picard dialect form), edited by G. Rohlf, with a short Introduction and a Glossary. In the second number, Karl Warnke's *Four Lays of Marie de France*, the editor reprints the Harleian MS as it stands, with very little editorial aid to the reader or student. The veteran editor of Marie surveys the recent literature dealing with the poetess, refusing to attach importance to the two forays of E. Levi and E. Winkler, but cautiously approving J. C. Fox's suggestion that Marie was the Abbess of Shaftesbury who is recorded for the years 1181-1216. The third number (two issues) is occupied by a reprint of the Oxford *Chanson de Roland*, by Alfons Hilka. The text is prepared with modern punctuation, with accents, and with signs for omission or addition; the editor also provides an interesting Preface on the history of *Roland* editing, and two glossaries, the first of proper names, the second of the more important words. In substance, this edition is a reprint of the Bodleianus, with numerous corrections adopted or suggested in footnote and a choice of readings from *V*⁴ and from *CV*⁷; of the last, Professor Hilka announces a new edition as in prospect, and intimates that the rhymed version may have been undervalued in the past. We note in the Preface a warm appeal to Romance scholars in Germany, urging them to revive the great tradition of ante-bellum days as it was upheld by Appel, Foerster, Gröber, P. Meyer, G. Paris, Schultze-Gora, Stimming, Suchier, Stengel, and Tobler: a wish in which the editors of *Modern Philology* heartily concur.

Two later issues in the same series are Salvatore Frascino's *Testi antichi italiani* (54 pages), and a collection of thirty Old Provençal lyrics, critically prepared by A. Kolsen, the well-known editor of Guiraut de Bornelh.—T. A. J.

Publication of the long-expected Italian national edition of the works of Petrarch is about to begin. The first volume to be issued will be the *Africa*, edited by Professor N. Festa. This will appear during the winter or early spring. The second volume will contain the *Epistolae Familiares*, edited by Professor V. Rossi, who is in general charge of the whole enterprise. The plan of the edition calls for a series of nineteen volumes, of which sixteen will be devoted to the Latin works, two to the Italian works, and one to indexes. The preparation of some of the volumes is well advanced; but it will probably be many years before the edition is complete.—E. H. W.

The "University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature," Volume IX, No. 3 (August, 1924), is a facsimile reproduction of the first edition of Fracastoro's *Naugerius, sive de poetica dialogus* (1555), with a fluent translation by Miss Ruth Kelso and a stimulating discussion of Fracastoro's place in Italian Renaissance criticism by Professor M. W. Bundy. In an Appendix a part of the *Actius* of Pontano is printed in the original Latin and in a translation by Miss Kelso. Students generally will welcome this excellent edition of one of the monuments of Renaissance criticism.

Two years ago the ancient Accademia della Crusca at Florence, founded in 1582, seemed in danger of extinction, its government subsidy having been suddenly withdrawn. A committee of citizens came to the rescue by collecting an endowment fund of half-a-million lire, and the members have resumed work upon the dictionary, the *Vocabolario della Crusca*, the eleventh volume (*N* to *P*) being now in process of publication. We recall that this monumental work was first published at Venice, in 1612; the last complete edition was issued 1729-38, while the present edition was begun as far back as 1863. Conceived on a far more liberal basis than the official dictionary of France, the *Vocabolario* has gained somewhat the same esteem as the final authority upon good usage in literary Italian. We note also the inception of another undertaking of more than national importance in Italy: a *Grande Enciclopedia Italiana* has been undertaken at Milan under the direction of Vittorio Rossi, of the University of Rome, well known for his work *Il Quattrocento* and for his *Storia della Letteratura Italiana*, first issued in 1900. Still another Italian project is the compilation of a national *Dizionario Biografico*, by a committee formed in Rome. Both these works are sorely needed.—R. ALTROCCHI.

The compilation known as the *Flor de las Ystorias de Orient, y Passage de la Tierra Santa* exists in an unedited MS of the Escorial. An edition of the work, based upon a photostatic copy of the MS which forms part of the collection made some five years ago by the late John M. Burnam, professor of Latin and Romance paleography at the University of Cincinnati, has been undertaken by Wesley R. Long, under the direction of Professor Hayward Kenis-

ton, of the University of Chicago. A Castilian version known as the *Viajes de Marco Polo a Orient* was printed in the sixteenth century; this contains the same matter translated from an Italian version, but there are important variants in the Escorial MS, which is written in an Aragonese dialect.

Max Victor Depta's *Pedro Calderon de la Barca* (Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer, 1925. Pp. 258) will serve the general reader rather than the specialist, for it contributes no original material and solves no problems; it is a concise introduction to what is already known about the dramatist. The author first treats briefly the development of Spanish drama before and after Calderón, then classifies the plays, résumés being given of every play, act by act, with the known dates of representation and printing, re-workings, translations, and imitations. For the latter feature and for the Bibliography, Dr. Depta is indebted to Breymann's *Calderon-Studien*, 1905, but he appears not to have consulted or made use of the reviews of Breymann's work by Stiefel, in 1906, which are indispensable for the control of Breymann besides containing much additional information. Nor does the author show acquaintance with Emilio Cotarelo's recent researches on the life and works of Calderón, published in the *Boletín de la Real Academia*, 1921-23. American Hispanists also fare badly in this book; no articles or editions by Americans are included in the lists. Aside from these omissions, this volume, which is quite similar in arrangement to Valentin Schmidt's *Die Schauspiele Calderons*, will undoubtedly be of some value to those who do not have ready access to that rare work. It does not, however, supersede it, for Depta's treatise is less accurate and less abundant in detail.—CARLOS CASTILLO.

Professor R. K. Root has completed his long study of the text of Chaucer's *Troilus and Cressida* with the publication of his edition of the poem (*The Book of Troilus and Criseyde*, Princeton University Press, 1926). This is not a critical text because Professor Root's (and Sir W. S. McCormick's) judgment as to the interrelation of the manuscripts does not permit the construction of such a text. Professor Root holds that of the three groups of manuscripts a derives from Chaucer's original, β from the poet's corrected and revised copy of the original (perhaps made by a professional scribe), γ from the same copy but without all the corrections (which may have been inserted in such a way that the scribe of γ 's original did not notice them). Whether this view is correct or not, probably no one who has not made the laborious comparisons to which Professor Root has devoted years can decide. In his Introduction Root summarizes the results of his earlier book (*The Textual Tradition of Chaucer's Troilus*). Thorough and definite as that study is, a scholar who reads it is likely to feel that a different emphasis on the detailed phenomena might have produced a different result. For instance, (1) it seems probable that Root bases his conclusions too much on the fact that in many cases of

variation either reading seems sufficiently correct or "Chaucerian." The variations in the *Canterbury Tales*, the various versions of *Piers the Plowman* and probably most other poems extant in several manuscripts are in many cases equally good, i.e., of a large body of variations one cannot say surely which is the error. It is certain that plenty of scribes could make small variations which read so well that they satisfy our modern taste. (2) The greater closeness of the α group to Chaucer's source turns on very slight differences; and in a good many cases β (or γ) is actually nearer to Boccaccio than α is. (3) The strongest evidence for Professor Root's view is the presence in α (Book I) of a stanza not found in the other groups of manuscripts and the omission in α of the stanzas on predestination (Book IV). But omission of stanzas could be explained on the theory of common error in α ; similarly, the fact that β and γ lack the stanza in Book I might be due to error in the common source of those groups.

Very likely these suggestions are wrong; but in view of the fact that Root admits that Chaucer's artistic purpose in making the multitudinous revisions in phrasing is not very clear (*Textual Tradition*, p. 261), one cannot feel quite satisfied with his theory. One would like to feel sure that an effort had been made on the basis of common errors (not variations) to trace the relations of manuscripts back to a single original. It cannot be said that past efforts to construct family trees of medieval poems have been notably successful; and possibly even if Professor Root's conclusions in this case are not correct, it might be impossible (because of contamination) to construct a genealogical table.

At any rate, the text constructed on a genealogical basis would not have such differences from the one printed in this edition as to invalidate any studies of Chaucer's literary art or language which may be made on the *Troilus*. And as Professor Root prints all important variant readings, scholars can see the possibilities of any single passage. Professor Root has added valuable and interesting notes on the poem, and the book is handsome in all its physical aspects.—J. R. H.

Professor Dudley D. Griffith, of the University of Washington, has published *A Bibliography of Chaucer, 1908-1924* ("University of Washington Publications in Language and Literature," Vol. IV, No. 1, pp. 1-48). In his Preface Professor Griffith disclaims any intention "to satisfy the needs of scholarship which will be met when Miss Hammond has completed the promised revision of her book" (*Chaucer: A Bibliographical Manual*). Nevertheless, his work is remarkably complete, simply and clearly arranged, and provided with an Index. It is an indispensable aid to the Chaucerian.—J. R. H.

A new series on "Language and Literature" in the University of Michigan publications is inaugurated with great success in *Studies in Shakespeare, Milton and Donne*, by Members of the English Department (New York:

Macmillan, 1925). "The Youth of Milton" and "*Samson Agonistes* and Milton in Old Age," by J. H. Hanford, and "The Religious Thought of Donne," by L. I. Bredvold, are in fields in which the authors have already done much excellent work. C. C. Fries in his article on "Shakespearian Punctuation" makes the most logical approach possible to the problem involved in his investigation by surveying the discussions of punctuation in the English grammars and rhetorics of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Unfortunately he does not include Mulcaster's *Elementarie*, which Simpson, the prime upholder of the theory of dramatic punctuation rejected by Fries, calls "the chief authority for Elizabethan punctuation" (*Ben Jonson*, ed. Herford and Simpson, II, 434). In two articles which open the volume, "*Love's Labour's Lost* Re-studied" and "*The Two Gentlemen of Verona* and Italian Comedy," O. J. Campbell argues that Italian comedy exerted the strongest influence on Shakespeare's two early plays. For *Love's Labour's Lost* he rejects the theory of a large indebtedness to Lyly's *Endimion* and finds the sources in events of French history, typical Elizabethan progresses, and Italian comedy. He believes that Shakespeare imported from Italian comedy "not isolated figures, but the entire groups of clownish masks," modifying them to meet the structural needs of his play and to reflect aspects of contemporary life (p. 43). For *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, stressing the resemblance of the plot to the Italian type of comedy represented in *GP Ingannati*, he rejects Montemayor's *Diana Enamorada* as the ultimate source and declares that Shakespeare found in Italian comedy "his plot in all of its constructive elements, and . . . many of the type-figures needed to animate it" (p. 63). Though there is much that is valuable in these studies of the Italian influence on Shakespearean comedy, the evidence adduced does not seem sufficient to overthrow the current views in regard to the sources of the romantic elements of the two plays or to shake seriously the position of those who hold that Shakespeare's comic technique represents an Elizabethan tradition which, despite the large contributions made to it by Italian and other literatures, is more largely English than foreign.—C. R. B.

A useful addition to the rapidly growing literature of monographs on the English eighteenth century is Walter Graham's *The Beginnings of English Literary Periodicals: A Study of Periodical Literature, 1665-1715*.¹ Professor Graham has examined, chiefly at the British Museum and the Bodleian, close to a hundred periodicals published during the fifty years covered by his study, and has described them in four chapters dealing successively with (1) "learned" periodicals, (2) periodicals designed mainly for the entertainment of their readers, (3) periodicals of moral criticism and reform, and (4) the early essay periodicals modeled upon the *Tatler* and the *Spectator*. The field thus surveyed was not exactly virgin territory; most of the journals mentioned by Professor Graham had been listed in some or all of the various

¹ New York: Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1926. Pp. iv + 92.

bibliographies of British periodicals, from Nichols and Hope to the *Times Handlist*, and the main aspects of their history had been indicated in a number of special studies, from the pioneer monograph of John Griffith Ames, *The English Literary Periodical of Morals and Manners* (1904), to the recent articles of Professor R. P. McCutcheon. There was room, however, for a new synthesis of the subject, and Professor Graham's book, brief as it is, will be welcomed by scholars as the most serviceable résumé of the facts, verified afresh from the original sources, that has yet appeared.

This is not to say that it could not easily have been made more serviceable. Particularly regrettable is the absence of a formal bibliography. It is true that the reader can usually extract from Professor Graham's descriptions the facts regarding particular periodicals which might be expected to appear in such a bibliography; but this is not always possible, and even when it is, the convenience of the bibliographical form for purposes of reference is too great to be foregone without protest. Again, extensive as is the documentation, it would not have been difficult, with a little extra research, to make it more nearly complete. The omission from chapter i of John Houghton's *Collection of Letters for the Improvement of Husbandry and Trade* (1681-84) and *Collection for the Improvement of Husbandry and Trade* (1692-1703), the significance of which for the development of book-reviewing has been recently shown by Professor McCutcheon,¹ is hard to explain, as is also the failure to mention, even in the notes, such other "learned" periodicals as the *Modern History*; or, *A Monthly Account of all Considerable Occurrences . . .*, with *all Natural and Philosophical Productions and Transactions* (1687-89), the *Philosophical Observer* (1695), the *Political History of Europe . . .*, with an *Account of New Books* (1697), the *New State of Europe, both as to Publick Transactions and Learning* (1701), *Useful Transactions in Philosophy* (1709), and De la Roche's *Memoirs of Literature* (1710-14, 1717), or such journals of amusement and satire as *Hippocrates Ridens* (1686), the *New Heracitus Ridens* (1689), the *Whipping Post: A New Session of Oyer and Terminer for the Scribblers* (1705), the *Diverting Muse; or, The Universal Medley* (1707), and Steele's *Lover* (1714).

A more serious defect is the lack of any real attempt at historical interpretation. Beyond a few rather perfunctory references to the influence of the Royal Society and the agitation for a "reformation of manners," Professor Graham is content to treat the development of periodicals in a vacuum, separated almost completely from the intellectual and social currents of the period. The result is that we are seldom or never illuminated by anything he has to say. Details we get in abundance, but not perspectives; and as the details are in the main of a bibliographical order, the exposition, unsustained by ideas, too often gives the effect of mere aimless fact-listing. A number of statements, finally, call for correction or qualification. Page 7: Robert Hooke's *Philosophical Collections*,

¹ *Modern Philology*, XX (1923), 255-60.

here dated 1681-82, began to appear in 1679. See *Term Catalogues*, I, 372, 419, 475. Page 32: The *History of the Works of the Learned* lasted beyond 1711 to at least March, 1712. Page 47: A second number of *Miscellanies over Claret* is available at Yale. Page 65: Steele's *Christian Hero* is not a poem! Pages 72-73: The account of the continuations of the *Tatler* is somewhat confused. In particular, it is not strictly accurate to say that Morphew's continuation "survived until May 19, overshadowed and finally eliminated by the rivalry of another spurious *Tatler* [Harrison's]." What happened was that Harrison, who had published Nos. 1-6 of his continuation through Mrs. A. Baldwin, shifted to Morphew on February 3 as a consequence of a quarrel with his printer, took over Morphew's numbering, and continued to publish through Morphew to the end of the series. In other words, from No. 285, February 1-3, to No. 330, May 17-19, Morphew's continuation and Harrison's were one and the same paper. The story becomes clear upon an examination of the original sheets; Professor Graham has evidently been misled through use of the reprint of Harrison's *Tatler*, in which the essays are renumbered 1-52. Page 78: It is not quite true that no copies of James Watson's Edinburgh reprint of the *Tatler* have been preserved. Couper's *Edinburgh Periodical Press* (I, 242-43) records the existence of two issues, Nos. 31 and 100, and the University of Chicago Library has recently acquired what seems to be a complete set, running from No. 1 (Steele's No. 130), February 13, 1710, to No. 142 (Steele's No. 271), January 9, 1711.—R. S. C.

Professor C. H. C. Wright's *Background of Modern French Literature* (Boston: Ginn & Co., 1926) adequately combines the useful with the attractive. Recognizing that the American student of French letters is often ill informed on matters of historical and social background, the author has furnished a series of interesting chapters on the politics and mores of nineteenth-century France. The book contains a great deal of accurate information, together with a certain amount of repetition. The numerous illustrations aid considerably in realizing the traits and oddities of the various epochs. The author's point of view, though less uncompromising than heretofore, remains that of a conscientious objector to most of the movements in nineteenth-century literature; and some of the arguments advanced in support of this attitude are not convincing. For example, in connection with Parisian gaieties, it is curious to see the name of the respectable Mrs. Trollope cited several times in condemnation of—the other trollops. The volume has a good Index, but the Bibliography at times omits essential data regarding the works indicated. Altogether, a handbook likely to entertain and also to aid the mature student.—E. P. D.

In *Roumanian Folk Tales Retold from the Original* ("University of Maine Studies" [2d series], No. 3, pp. 1-105) Professor Jacob Bernard Segall has furnished American readers with adaptations of seven tales taken from

Ispirescu, *Legende satî Basmele Românilor* (1892). The work is "meant for the general reading public, and not for the professional folklorist." In preparing it for this audience the features which might make it useful to the scholar have been intentionally obscured and any yielding to his convenience is resisted. In a work striving for style the general reading public would scarcely expect to find such turns of phrase as "a great big dragon" (p. 12 and *passim*), "bonny lassie" (p. 15). There are many other examples of an uncertain swaying between a childish and a literary vocabulary. The frequently interspersed rhetorical questions and exclamations as well as the long sentimental passage on page 59 are quite out of keeping with the spirit of the folktale. The bibliographer will note that the work is also referred to as *Seven Roumanian Fairy Tales* on the third page of the cover.—A. T.

A welcome addition to the linguistic periodicals is the Norwegian *Meddelelser fra norsk forening for sprogvidenskap* (Oslo: Aschehoug, 1925 ff.), which will appear in fascicles at irregular intervals. Notwithstanding its Norwegian title the articles and reviews will be printed almost entirely in English, French, or German. The first number consists of the society's proceedings and thirty-seven pages of reviews. The variety of subjects discussed is enormous: Basque, Breton, Frisian, Iranian, Slavic languages, and phonetics. The publishers have provided an attractive format.—A. T.

The general advice in Georg Baesecke's *Wie studiert man Deutsch? Ratschläge für Anfänger* (2d ed.; Munich: Beck, 1926; 39 pp.) will benefit the German student rather more than the American, although the latter will profit to some extent from the picture of German conditions. Thoroughly admirable is the addition in this second issue of a Bibliography of books and essays for the beginner. Here the notable thing is the inclusion of a number of periodical articles which the beginner is expected to read as an introduction to scholarly method. In another edition this admirable feature might be extended further. Inasmuch as folk-lore makes its appearance in the list of auxiliary subjects of study, it would be particularly desirable to mention an example or two of scholarly method: in this field the beginner cannot easily discover what to follow as a model and what to avoid. The example should of course be Walter Anderson, *Kaiser und Abt, FF Communications*, 42. The slip on page 36 should be corrected: Fr. von der Leyen's excellent book *Das Märchen* is in the series "Wissenschaft und Bildung," his brochure *Das deutsche Märchen* is something quite different and does not appear in the same series. Baesecke's suggestive and helpful Bibliography is cheap at the nominal price asked for this pamphlet. It can be admirably supplemented by R. M. Meyer, *Anleitung zur deutschen Literaturgeschichte* (Berlin, Bong), which gives a fuller list of recommended editions of the standard authors.—A. T.

DOCUMENTS AND RECORDS

EXTRACTS FROM A FOURTEENTH-CENTURY ACCOUNT BOOK

One of the most spectacular events of Richard's reign—his quarrel with the citizens of London—is indirectly touched upon in Maghfeld's accounts. After a bitter feud, during which the Mayor and other high officials had been removed from office and replaced by a warden and sheriffs, not elected by the commonalty but appointed by the King, and the liberties of the city had been withdrawn, peace was made in August, 1392. There was a day of pageantry when the King and Queen came in state to forgive their erring subjects; and at the head of the four-mile procession of the guilds rode the newly appointed warden and sheriffs, Thomas Newenton (Newton) and Gilbert Maghfeld. It is in the light of these events that the following entry in the account book is to be read:

Anno xvj^e mensis Julij

Thomas Newenton vn dez viscontes de Loundres doit en le xij^e

iour de Juyl pour vn ton de vin blank a vj marcz sans gauge.vj marcz

quia in scawagio

alibi Item il doit en le iour quant les viscountz alont a tour pour j

hatte de beueriiij s. iiij. d.¹

The tun of wine may or may not have been bought to celebrate Newton's newly acquired shrievalty (so many such purchases are recorded); but the beaver hat was acquired on September 30, when, we know from the *Letter Book*, the King being absent, the sheriffs, Newton and Maghfeld, their offices now confirmed by vote as well as by royal favor, rode to the Tower where they were officially presented to the lieutenant of the constable.² That the beaver hat for which money was borrowed on this day was part of the sheriff's livery is made almost certain by the words written in the margin (*alibi*) and above the entry (*quia in scavage*). As "scavage" was a tax out of which liveries were provided for city officials,³ the meaning is clear: Maghfeld was to be repaid from this source, and had noted the item in a separate account.

Of this famous quarrel there is another hint in Maghfeld's book. The first warden appointed by the King, Sir Edward Dalyngrigg, a knight frequently associated in the records with men known to Chaucer, was, within a

¹ f. xxliij. Canceled. The *tour* is the Tower of London.

² Cal. *Letter Book*, H, pp. 379, 383, 385, 388. In the account book, under the heading for July are placed various items of later date.

³ Cal. *Letter Book*, H, pp. 350 f.

month, replaced by Sir Baldwin de Radyngton; but even his short term of office must have loaded him with debts. The accounts read:

Anno xvj^o mensis Februari

Monsieur Edward Dalyngrigg chevalier doit par Bille enselez de son seall en le xxviii iour de Juyl a paier deinz vn moys prochein apres le seint Michel. x li.
Item il doit par obligacion fait le x iour daugust a paier a Noell apres. x li.
Item il doit de veille dette par obligacion. iiiij. li. xiiij s. iiiij d.
quia postea¹

Although he already owed the equivalent of \$600-\$700, he borrowed, within two weeks, the equivalent of about \$3,000 more.

Of Maghfeld's wealth some indications were given in Part I of this article.² Not only did he share in the partition of forfeited lands, notably of Sir Simon Burley, with whom Chaucer was sent on a secret mission in 1376, of Sir Nicholas Brembre, Chaucer's associate for many years in the customs, and Sir Robert Bealknap, with whom Chaucer served on a commission in 1385-86,³ but he had shares in property in at least eight different parishes in London.⁴ And in Billingsgate he had a great house with a wharf and other property to the value of forty marks a year (about \$4,000),⁵ where, it is to be supposed, he conducted his business. If so, he was within five minutes' walk of Chaucer at the Custom House.⁶

Like Chaucer, Maghfeld had at least one profitable wardship.⁷ In 1379 he obtained the wardship and marriage of John, son and heir of John de Frogenhale, whose property included Boclond, Tenham, Lyndestede, Tonge, Ludyngham, Herteye, Osprenge, Davyngton, and Stone by Osprenge, in Kent.⁸ This wardship Maghfeld had, without paying anything for it, from one John Kent, a "yeoman of the buttry" to the King, who had himself received it November 27, 1376. That this John Kent was known to Chaucer seems certain from the positions of the two at court; and some of the lands were within a few miles of the Staplegate property, of which Chaucer was in charge until 1377.⁹

¹ f. xxix. Canceled.

² See *Mod. Phil.*, XXIV (1926), 111-19.

³ See the indexes of the Patent and Close Rolls under these names.

⁴ Cf. the Husting Rolls of London: Nos. 103/83; 114/118, 131; 106/72, 90, 91, 94, 95, 147, 148; 108/39; 111/36; 112/104; 115/95; 120/131; 121/24, 210; 124/104.

⁵ C.P.R. (1396-99), p. 348.

⁶ He was also a neighbor and business associate of one of the Mordons—distant relatives of Chaucer; and in 1376 he was of a group that acquired some property in London from John Mannyng, cordwainer, who may or may not have been Chaucer's nephew (cf. *MLN*, XXIII [1908], 52).

⁷ Chaucer seems to have made the equivalent of about \$15,000 for taking care of Edmund de Staplegate for eighteen months (cf. *L.R.*, IV, 196 f.); what he made from his other ward, the heir of John Solys, does not appear.

⁸ C.P.R. (1385-89), p. 21.

⁹ The relationship may have been still closer. On July 12, 1376, Chaucer was given 71l. 4s. 6d., the amount forfeited by "John Kent, of London," who had exported wool to Dordrecht and had evidently been caught by Chaucer (*L.R.*, IV, 199). Unfortunately, there were several men of the name in London at this time, and we cannot tell which of them tried to smuggle out the wool.

In Maghfeld's accounts there are various references to these manors. One whole page is filled with lists of things sent in from one of them between Michaelmas and December 17, 1392, evidently for the use of Maghfeld's household. The items include: wheat, oats, barley, "otemele," ewes, "porks," a boar, cocks, hens, capons, "chekyns," "dossers" of doves, walnuts, hempseed (a bushel of it at a time!), and on one occasion two hundred eggs. What luxuries were added to these abundant staples the accounts do not show.

More interesting, perhaps, is an itemized account of expenses for the schooling of John de Frogenhale and William Maghfeld at Croydon (near London). Apparently the boys were very young. This is shown by the difference in cost between the schoolmaster's "chaux" (20*d.*) and those for the boys (8*d.*), and the low price of their "soulers" (4*d.* each) and the large number they wore out (sixteen pairs in fifteen months); also, by the low rate of their "commons" (a shilling a week apiece), the small sum given them, apparently for pocket money, the low salary paid the master, and the use of the word "enfantz."¹

The school seems to have been in the house of the Vicar of Croydon. Maghfeld gave the Vicar a cade of herring and a small basket of figs, and he also tipped the servants in the Vicar's house; but the small salary of the "skolelestre" (1 *m.* a year, equivalent to about \$100), and the frequent gifts of "chaux," besides the coat of Maghfeld's livery at Christmas, suggest that he was some poor clerk hired by the Vicar. The board for the boys was probably paid to the Vicar.

The accounts read:

Anno xvij^o mensis Maij

Johan Frogenhale & William Maghfeld fuerent enuoyes a Croydon al	
escole le veille de seint Dunstan paiaint par symaigne.....	ij s.
Item paie en le veille de seint Michel anno xviii ^o pour xix symaigne....	xxxviii s.
Item done al mestre pour lour scoleyement.....	iiij s. iiij d.
Item paie a luy le mesme iour chauxsure.....	ij s.
Item paie le veille de Noell pour xij symaigne.....	xxiiiij s.
Item pour iiij paire soulers.....	xvj d.
Item ij paire chaux xvj d.....	Summa....xxvj s. viij d.
Item deliure a Noell vne liure appelle este qe coste.....	vij s.
Item done al mestre pour lour scoleyement.....	iiij s. iiij d.

¹ The original ward came of age in 1393 (*C.P.R.* [1388-92], p. 511, and *C.C.R.* [1392-96], p. 182). The school expenses end in 1395, when he was twenty-three years old. It seems probable that the John de Frogenhale who was one of the "enfantz" was his young son, Maghfeld having brought about a marriage some time before his ward came of age. In 1400-1401, John de Frogenhale was dead, and 'his son and heir, William, a minor in the King's hands (*C.P.R.* [1399-1401], pp. 331, 437). According to the *Inquisitiones post Mortem* (IV, 43), a John, son of John de Frogenhale, held Bokelond, Leeds Castle, Ludenham, the ward of Dover Castle, Dodyngton, Lyndestede, Tenham, Tonge, Herteye, and Ospringe, seventh Henry V. William, moreover, continued to be named as a royal ward, in whose minority the King made the appointments to Bokelond Church, as late as 1416 (*C.P.R.* [1416-22], p. 11). However these statements are to be reconciled, it looks as if the "enfant" in Maghfeld's keeping is the younger John.

Item pour ij payre chaux pour le deuxxvj d.
 Item done al vycare de Croydon le viij iour de Feb [sic] anno xviii^e vn
 Cade haryng pris vj s. & j petit freyl Fygusxvj d.

Item paie pour xiiij symaigne cest assauer del Epiphanie tanqez a
 pasche anno xviii^esumma xxviij s.
 Item pour iiij paire soulers.xvj d.
 Item done as seruantz deinz lostiell del vicare.xx d.
 Item en expensis de moy mesme & mes chualx a Croydonxv d.
 Item paie al scolemestre pour son salere.xl d.
 Item pour j Parre chaux.xij d.
 Summa iiij s. iiij d.

Item done al mestre pour j paiere chauxxx d.
 Item lendemayn de saint Johan Baptiste anno xix^e paie al skolemestre.iiij s. iiij d.
 Item le mesme temps as deux enfant.viij d.
 Item paie pour lours comune par xj symaigne cest assauer tanqez al viij
 iour de Juyl lan xix^exxij s.
 Item pour lour soulers.xvj d.
 Item pour le lauender pour lauer leurs drapsxvj d.
 Item despend par Frogenhalle par ij foith.xv d.

Item paie pour xij symaignes del iour de saint Thomas Martir tanqez
 al Saint Michelxxiiij s.
 Item al mestre pour son salerexl d.
 Item a luy pour j pare chauxxx d.
 Item pour lez enfants iiij pare soulers.xvj d.
 Item iiij paire chauxij s. iiij d.
 Item pour le lavender.vj d.
 Summa xxxiiij s. ix d.

Item done al mestre j cote de mon lyuereye oue le fourour encontre
 Noell anno xix^e precio[?].xj s. viij d.
 Summa iiij li. v s. v d.¹

There are various indications that Maghfeld, like Chaucer's Merchant, was "estatly" of his "gouvernaunce." There are payments in the book to at least six servants: a butler ("Watekyn nostre botiller"), a man cook (at first, Michel; later, Richard); two women servants (Isabella and Margaret), and two "vallets." Some entries are in Maghfeld's own writing as the content shows; others are in the hands of clerks, who refer to "mon maistre."²

One of the most suggestive items is a group of expenses connected with the building in of a "lavour" or washing-place in his hall.³ The entry reads:

¹ f. xxxviijs.

² Various other names, recurring often in the book and not appearing in the Rolls, are probably those of men connected in different ways with the business.

³ The "lavatorium" of the monasteries, of which there is a fine example in the cloisters at Gloucester.

Anno xvij^o mensis Augusti

leed	Memorandum qe en le Moys daugust anno xvij ^o Jankyn Beau-
nouell	champ Plomer doit a nous pour vij ct. iiij lb. de plom. Et auxi
il ad	doit deliuer a luy par Thomas Craft iiij C & v ct. de plom veill
receu	Dont nous auoms receu par le dit Thomas iiij C de Wyghtes
	nouell Dont nous auoms receu de luy de nouell plom pour
	Billyngesgate x ct. iiij lb.
	Item receu j fylat de plom pour le gooter de la lauour en la
	sale pon [sic] C vj ct. vj lb. Item auoms receu diuers temps
	pour Billyngesgate & pour nostre
de nous	maison de mesme. viij C dj xiiij lb.
xv dj	Dont il ad receu de nous j foither de veill leed. xj C xiiij lb. Summa
xxv	Item nous auoms receu de nouell led Cesterne pour puddyng- totalis
lb.	lane pond C dj ^o . j lb. Item xvij lb. sowdure. s.
nous	Item nous doioms a luy pour le faceoun de auantditz choses xxx
doyoms	soudure & portage. xxx s. ij d. ij d.
a luy	Computum est en le veile de Nowell anno xvij ^o & paye tout
pour le	ency qe le dit plomer doit le mesme iour de veill led dj. C xxv lb. ¹
faceoun	
de xv	
xxj lb.	

The building of a wharf is several times referred to. The first items are:

Anno xv mensis Junij

Henry Sanderkyn tymberman doit a nous a tant de bord de ij vnch
come est suffysant pour tout nostre Wharf & deust deliuerer le dit bord
a nous en la fyn du moys de Juyl. x s.
dont il ad receu le v io. r du dit moys deuant la main. & rest x s. a luy
Item il ad receu de mon mestre en le xxv ^o iour de Septembre. vj s. viij d.
Item paie a luy le xxviij iour doctobre. iiij s. iiij d. ²

A month later we read:

Anno xvj^o mensis Julij

Memorandum qe Symkyn Carpenter de Southwerk doit dapprest en le
veigle de Seint James par G. Maghfled lez mains. v li.
Item paye par le dit G. a lui en lendemain del Assumpcion nostre dame
pour xxiiij iournes et pour ij bemes al Wharf & vj gistes & iiij quarters
de tymber. xxv s.
Item il doit en le xxj iour de Septembre pour CC Wainscot. xxxviij s.
Item similitier a luy en xxviij ^o iour doctobre. iiij li.

M

Item il doit pour DJC de Wainscot pour le sire de Cobaham. ix s. vj d. ³
--

Two years later:

Anno xvij^o

Memorandum qe iay paye pour le Wharf de billyngesgate primus pour
tymber xj s. Item pour lym & piers & sond. ij s. vj d. Item en
Carpentere & masons viij s. viij d. Summa. xxij s. ij d. ⁴

¹ f. xxxijb. ² f. xxliijb. Canceled. ³ f. xxliija. Canceled. ⁴ f. xlijb. Canceled.

At the very end of the book is an undated list of moneys due from Thomas Craft, who was associated with Maghfeld (possibly as his man of business) in many affairs:

Item ieo doy a luy [Craft?] pour le Feuere qe fesoit [= fesoit] lez cletes [?] & lez Bandez pour le Caye.....xxxi s. iiij d.¹

Either the building of the quay or the settlement of the accounts for it dragged on for several years.

One of the most interesting pages in the book concerns a transaction in coal. It contains: (1) a copy of an indenture between Roger Drayton, of Yarmouth, and Tydeman Hare, captain of a Danish ship called "la Marieknyth," for the delivery in the Pool² of London within a specified time of a shipload of coal for which the captain was to be paid 6s. 6d. a "chaldron" by the measure of London,³ within fourteen work-days after delivery; (2) a comment giving the day of arrival of the captain with his cargo; (3) a personal letter from Drayton, evidently to Maghfeld, very interesting for its familiar idioms; and (4) a dry comment on the price at which the coal was sold, 2s. a chaldron less than the original price given.⁴ It is not clear to me who stood the loss.

Anno xvij^o mensis Aprilis

Ceste endenture testmoigne qe Roger de Drayton Burgeys & merchant de graunde Jernemuth ad achate le iour de la fesaunce de cestes a dite Jernemuth de Tydeman Hare mestre dune Nief appelle la Marieknyth de Dansk tous lez carbouns esteants en la dite Nief en Rode de kyrkele pour descharger & deliuerer a dit Roger ou son attorne as costages & auenture de dit Tydeman en la pole en port de Loundres chescun chaldron par la mesure de Loundres pour vj. s. vj d. Et quaut la dite Nief est venu en la pole en port susdit la nief serra descharge & le mestre de la nief bien paye vj s. vj d. pour chescun shaldron [sic] par le dit Roger ou son attorne deinz xiiij iours ouerables procheins ensuans apres la venu de dite Nief en la Pole en port susdit Mes le Mestre de la nief auandite ad graunte a dit Roger qe sil busoigne de iiij iours ou v outre lez auaunditz xiiij iours le dit Roger auera volunters En testmoignaunce de quelles choses lez parties auaunditz a cestes endentures entrechaungeablement ont mys lour sealx Escript a Jernemuth la tierce iour de Feuerer Lan du Reigne nostre sire le Roy Rychard secounde xvij^o

le dit Tydeman vient a Loundres primerement en le iour de seint Gregore le pape [March 12] ouesqe sa dite Nief charges de carbons

Cher amy voletz sauoir qe ieo estoye a Loundres expectaunt vostre venue bien par vn Moys & Pluis & issint pour ceo qe vous ne venistes pas & le vente estoit bon

¹ xlvij^s; six folios beyond one dated the eighteenth year, evidently, then, about 1395-96.

² The Thames east of London Bridge; still so called.

³ According to the *New English Dictionary*, a "chaldron" was a dry measure of four quarters, i.e., 32 bushels; but as a measure for coal, it was 36 bushels in 1615. As the "measure of London" is specified, evidently the amount varied.

⁴ Even so (according to *Cal. Letter Book*, H, p. 289) it was dear. About 1386, the price of coal was regulated not to exceed 9d. a quarter, i.e., about 3s. a "chaldron."

My dear Mr. Chillye
I have just received your letter of the 10th inst. and am
glad to hear from you. I am well and hope these few lines
will find you the same. I have not much news to write
at present. I am still in the same place and doing the
same work. I have not much time to write at present
but will write again soon. I am, dear Mr. Chillye,
very truly yours,
Gilbert Magfeld

LETTER FROM JOHN CHILLYE TO GILBERT MAGFELD, WRITTEN IN ENGLISH BETWEEN 1390 AND 1398

ieo menalaye deuers meson quidant qe vous estoyetz aliours pour fere vostre profit en testmoinne de vostre hoste qar ieo estoye chescun iour a sa meson pour demander apres vous & pour ceo fetez vostre profit de vostre¹ merchandise come del vostre propre qar ieo suye occupie aliours issint qe ieo ne puisse venir qant a present a dieu cher amy Et cher amy vous face assauoir qe Robert Elyot at alowe vn vallet portour de cestes pour iiij s. Dont il a luy Baila ij s. en main & le remenant vous a luy payers [sic]

Par Roger Drayton

Ceste lettre fust receu le ij^{de} iour d'aprrill Et le viij^e iour apres prochein lez ditz carbons furent venduz par iiij s. vj d. le Chaldron²

But there is another letter still more interesting. When the book was first examined, a sheet of paper was found caught into the binding so that only part of it could be read. When it was rescued, it was seen to be a torn and rat-eaten letter addressed to Gilbert Maghfild. The address reads:

a Gybon Maufeld

a loundres soit donn [remainder is gone]

The letter is in English—one of the very few dated before 1400:

[e]hal[l] be ffreye pys goor le[tter?] oor

bat oure marcha[nts? ndise?]

more be crayer a

proff [?]

lang after bat he bouth bourwes in spayn & kyn[g]

portyngal wyt hym & al be tydyngys bat y c so[?]

mont & al oder [pyngys?] bat y haue y[n] charge b

mende & praye sou grettyt wel my maystris & Geffrey]

& hys wyf & al de³ oder gode ffrendys y be t[a]k[e] sou [to God?]

body & soul pys let[ter] was y wryt at lousbon⁴ [?] be

par J chillye

"My maystris" is probably Maghfild's wife, of whom nothing is known; and "Geffrey" is certainly his brother, often named with him in the Rolls in the same business transactions. Of John Chillye, also associated with the two brothers, it is perhaps enough to say that on one occasion he with the Maghfilds and three other merchants stood mainpernor for the sum of 2000*l.* (about \$300,000 today),⁵ the share of each being twice the share of Chaucer when with Sir John de Beverley he stood mainpernor for Sir William Beauchamp.

These few extracts suggest but faintly the wealth of interest in the ninety-four pages of this forgotten old account book. Besides its value for the eluci-

¹ The sense seems to require *nostre* here.

² f. xxxvija.

³ Erased.

⁴ Lisbon, probably. Cf. "oil of Lusshebone" and "cyvyll" (Seville) mentioned in *Cal. Letter Book* (1381-82), H, p. 175.

⁵ C.C.R. (1381-85), p. 571.

dation of social and economic history,¹ it is to students of Chaucer of peculiar interest for its illumination of the poet's environment and associates. Believing, as some of us now do,² that Chaucer had the habit of drawing his figures from the life, we are faced with the question whether Gilbert Maghfeld was the original of the Merchant. Coincidences must not be pressed, but they may at least be stated. It can hardly be denied that Maghfeld was a merchant of the type described by Chaucer. Both were "estatly" of "governaunce" with their "bargaynes" and their "chevisaunce" (of which Chaucer and many of his associates at court and in the city took advantage); and if Maghfeld, unlike the Merchant, did not succeed in concealing the fact that he was in debt until he died a bankrupt, at least there is no hint of unsound financial status in the printed records. His many dealings with foreigners (not discussed in this paper) would have certainly warranted the line: "Wel coude he in eschaunge sheeldes selle." His "Flandrish bever hat" at once suggests the "bever hat" worn by Sheriff Newenton (and undoubtedly by Maghfeld) when the two rode formally to the Tower, September 30, 1392; but we cannot assume that sheriffs wore the only beaver hats. Still, the "mottelee" and "hye on hors" must be investigated. Is it possible that to Chaucer's contemporaries they suggested a state "riding" of city officials?³ As to the "keeping of the sea," it is usually interpreted to mean the Merchant's concern for the safety of his wool between Middelburg and Orwell; but there is no hint in the text (as Mr. Manly shows) that he was a wool stapler (nor was Maghfeld); and the line may not impossibly be a sly hit at the fact that several years before Maghfeld had been one of the four "keepers of the narrow sea,"⁴ and since they were ousted within six months, the comment would not have been without malice.

All in all, while it must be admitted that many another merchant might have fulfilled the conditions of the picture in the *Prologue*, this fragmentary account book⁵ shows that Maghfeld was a familiar figure at court and in the city, hence a likely subject for satire; and it also supplies a better motive than any yet given for Chaucer's refusal to tell the Merchant's name: he might have need of another "chevisaunce"!

EDITH RICKERT

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

¹ Secondary, yet not to be overlooked, are its contributions to the history of English words. The value of these will not be known until the MS has been thoroughly analyzed; but the following list is suggestive: *cellarage* (as used; *New English Dictionary*, 1602); *chaldron* (*ibid.*, 1615); *cleats* (? not in *ibid.*, as used); *cranage* (as used, *ibid.*, 1481-90); *daghers* (*ibid.*, 1485); *fylat* (*ibid.*, 1663); *spring spars* (coppersmith's tools; not in *ibid.*); *lyghterman* (*ibid.*, 1558); *lymbelyus* (? quicklime; not in *ibid.*); *pathyng* (*ibid.*, 1428-29) and *pathyngtel* (not given). Many other words of unknown or uncertain meaning might have been added.

² See J. M. Manly, *Some New Light on Chaucer*.

³ In at least one other case Chaucer describes a Pilgrim, not as he rode to Canterbury, but as he looked in his uniform at home: the Yeoman is ready for woodcraft in the forest, not for a pilgrimage.

⁴ So called in the Rolls; cf. *C.P.R.* (1396-99), p. 207.

⁵ As it was confiscated and preserved among the public records, it may be that the remainder of it and perhaps other account books are among the mass of documents still uncalendared.

